UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreviewo216londuoft

The Edinburgh Review

or Critical Journal

JULY, 1912 —————— OCTOBER, 1912

To be continued Quarterly

Edited by HAROLD COX

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR
PUBLIUS SYRUS

VOL. 216

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
London, Bombay, and Calcutta
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, New York
1912

Contents of Vol. 216.

No. 441 — July, 1912

		PAGE
India and her Sovereign	. . . . .	1
The Causes of Chinese Unrest	J. O. P. BLAND . . .	21
The Hôtel de Rambouillet	EDMUND GOSSE, C.B. .	41
Fox	HORACE BLEACKLEY .	62
The Rousseau Bicentenary	FRANCIS GRIBBLE. .	75
Chauvinism in Music	MRS. ROSA NEWMARCH	95
Zoology in the Time of Shakespeare	DR. SHIPLEY, F.R.S. .	117
On Safety of Life at Sea	. . . . .	139
The Changing Status of Oriental Women	SAINT NIHAL SINGH .	163
The New Renaissance in France	. . . . .	187
A Famous Heresy Trial	REV. ALFRED FAWKES	202
Home Rule Economics	. . . . .	216
Contemporary Politics	THE EDITOR . . .	235

No. 442 — October, 1912

Mr. Balfour in the Study	SIDNEY LOW	257
Secret Remedies	HUGH S. ELLIOT	279
Sir William Herschel	A. R. HINKS	302
The First of the Fenians	HARRY GRAHAM	321
A Seventeenth-Century Admiral and Diplomat	. . . . .	340
Sir Walter Scott and Joanna Baillie	VICTOR G. PLARR	355
Current Literature	WALTER DE LA MARE	372
The Church Militant	. . . . .	390
Apprenticeship and the Training of the Workman	CYRIL JACKSON	411
Democracy and Liberalism	ARTHUR A. BAUMANN	428
The Presidential Election in the United States	. . . . .	447
Politics and Prices	THE EDITOR	469
The Problem of Persia	LOVAT FRASER	489

The Edinburgh Review

JULY, 1912 No. 441

INDIA AND HER SOVEREIGN

1. India under Curzon and After. By LOVAT FRASER. 3rd ed. William Heinemann. 1912.
2. India and the Durbar. Reprinted from the 'Times.' Macmillan. 1911.
3. Proceedings of Bengal Chamber of Commerce. May 3, 1912.
4. Debates in Parliament.

IN spite of many telegraphed columns describing the imperial pageantry of the Delhi Durbar, and in spite of a very effective and wonderfully accurate reproduction of the most picturesque scenes by means of the kinemacolor, there is good reason to fear that the British public as a whole has so far failed to grasp the tremendous importance of the royal visit to India. Partly this is due to the necessary preoccupation of Englishmen at home with their own domestic politics. During a large part of the time that the King was in India the fate of the Insurance Bill—probably one of the most far-reaching measures ever submitted to Parliament—was still in suspense, and to Englishmen interested in party politics the question whether the Unionists would have courage to advise the Lords to reject the Bill was more exciting than the progress of their Sovereign through the cities of his Indian Empire. Subsequently when

All rights reserved.

considered judgments on the profound political importance of the King's visit began to arrive by mail, the attention of the country had been switched off to the threatened coal strike. These circumstances would alone largely account for the inadequate appreciation of the great event of last December. But there is a further and a deeper reason. The majority of Englishmen at home have curiously little knowledge of India. To most of them it is like Egyptology, or some special and recondite study. They have no time for it. It is too far away; the very nomenclature of the subject is a burden; there are so many other problems and activities nearer home, which seem better to repay study and are more essential to society conversation and to an understanding of the leading articles of the daily press.

As for the masses, though in many cases their existence depends either on the products or the markets of India, their education has been so arid and unstimulating that they can hardly be blamed if they concentrate their thoughts on sport or on wages, and ignore the great continent which supplies the raw materials and consumes the finished articles of British industry. The time may not be far distant when the working classes of England will be forced to take an interest in the awakening of India, but for the present that interest is non-existent. Thus, neither among the well-educated few nor among the ill-educated many is there a sufficient grasp of India to enable the King's extraordinary achievement to be appraised at its full value.

There are wise men connected with the administration of India in England who have been thankful for this prevailing ignorance, and have persistently deprecated any attempt to bring India nearer to the British public. They know too well the limitations of British Parliaments, and dread the impact of an ill-informed and unimaginative democracy upon 315 millions of the most ancient and conservative races in the world.

For this attitude there was good ground in the days of Victoria, whose unconscious statecraft and sympathetic personality did so much to bind India to England. Victorian India was the India of a strong bureaucratic Government, under Viceroys whose ideals were efficiency and equal justice, and who were content if they could make India safe on the frontier

mountains and prosperous in the plains. How they succeeded may be read in many books, and it is worth noting that the most generous witnesses to British success in the East are not English, but French or German writers. These great Viceroys, whose names will never be forgotten in India, were loyally helped by the Indian civil servants. During the spacious days of Queen Victoria, the preoccupation of the Service was to make the people safe and prosperous, to fight for them in times of famine and plague, and to protect them against plundering raiders and extortionate landlords. The Indian civilian had no mandate to instruct the people in the arts of politics, nor to engraft on the old tree of aristocracy the doubtful scions of an untried. democracy. With slender means, for there were few financial windfalls in the Victorian era, he did his best, and the result was steady progress and peace within the borders.

But this period of placid development could not last indefinitely. The ever-increasing closeness of contact between East and West had given birth to new ideals in the minds of the educated classes in India. It was impossible for Indians who had lived even for a few months in the democratic atmosphere of Great Britain to ever again accept the Oriental conception of unquestioning obedience to persons placed in authority. Nor could it be expected that the teaching of English history and English literature in Indian schools would be without effect upon the minds of Indian boys ripening to manhood. The doctrine of liberty has no natural limitations of climate or of race, and Sikhs and Bengalis and Mahrattas, learning what this doctrine had done for Englishmen, would have been less than human if they had not asked whether it could do nothing for them.

These social and educational impulses would alone have made some change sooner or later inevitable, but it has so happened that within the last decade a series of events have occurred which have immensely re-inforced the impulses just described. If, indeed, we seek for a dividing line we may fairly say that the old régime ended with Queen Victoria. The mere fact of her death was a tremendous event in India. Her long reign and her known love for the people of India had given to her a personal influence the full value of which was only realised when she was dead. It happened, moreover, that her last

Viceroy was a man of extraordinary strength of character, endowed with great ability, with a high sense of duty, and colossal industry. His work has been admirably described by Mr. Lovat Fraser, who had exceptional opportunities of observing that work while it was in progress. It may safely be said that Lord Curzon was probably the most vigorous and efficient pro-consul that England has ever produced. But the bent of his mind was in the direction of perfecting old methods, not of evolving new ideals. He devoted himself to making the Indian Government, such as he found it, as perfect a machine as it could be made. In so doing he ran counter to many easy-going practices. Civilians of long experience found themselves speeded up, and though their pace may have been advantageously quickened, their prestige may also have suffered. But while Lord Curzon thus increased by his own energy the efficiency of the old régime, he did nothing to conciliate the native exponents of the new ideals. His very temperament made it impossible for him to do so. His authority rested solely upon his own striking qualities and on the prestige of his great office, and the latter by a fatal accident was destroyed.

The Curzon-Kitchener controversy, which to Englishmen at home meant little more than a quarrel between two strong men, meant in India a crushing blow to the almost more than regal authority which the Viceroy had previously wielded. Possibly if Lord Curzon had been succeeded by another strong man, the prestige of the Government of India might have been restored, but Lord Minto, though courageous to a fault where risks to his own life were involved, lacked the strength of character to defend his government against interference from home. He allowed himself to be directed in every detail by a Secretary of State new to his task, and more confident of his own intuition than of the slowly acquired knowledge of 'sun-dried bureaucrats.' Our readers will remember the scene in Dotheboys Hall when Nicholas felled the brutal Squeers. India is very like a school. In the Indian school the masters were humane and fair, but in any school if authority be shaken the scholars run wild. And for some years India ran wild. There was a miserable period of sedition and outrage, assassination and boycott. Concession affecting the few, and repression profoundly affecting the many, were the dreary programme. There was repression in India

and suppression of the real facts in England, and then followed the reforms which were to allay the rising tempest. It is not our purpose to discuss these reforms, nor to prophesy their results. We need only say two things. The first is that they have enormously hampered and weakened the ruling power as it existed in Queen Victoria's time, the second is that they did not put an end to sedition.

Peace has been made, not by legislative reforms, but by the courageous resolve of the one man to whom Indians of all degrees, all religions, and all races look for the sign. Strange as it may seem to the democrats of England, the Indians do not appreciate the House of Commons, even though some of them have had the advantage of seeing Mr. Keir Hardie. The one power they all recognise is the personal power of their Emperor, King George. To the great chiefs and princes—and be it remembered that they are a very important factor in our hold over India—King George appeals by his lineage more ancient than their own. To the Hindus he appeals as Emperor—Emperor by divine right—a right inculcated by every Brahman priest and by every Hindu father. To the Mahomedans he appeals as the Sovereign of more followers of Islám than the Calif himself.

It is with King George's courageous and far-seeing resolve and its results that we deal in this article. As sailor prince he roved over many parts of the world, but he did not visit India until six years ago, and it was then he obtained his remarkable insight into the ideas and requirements of the people, and his marvellous and undoubted hold upon their affection. During his six months of strenuous travel in India as Prince of Wales, he saw the continent still under the surviving influence of the Victorian régime of efficient government and material well-being. There was no sedition, and assassination was as yet undreamed of in the gentle home of mild Hinduism. The Prince came back full of information and full of genuine liking for the peoples—those three hundred and fifteen millions 'split up into groups of inherent diversities, so dissimilar and 'incongruous in race, language, and religion, that Europe by 'comparison seems to be almost homogeneous.' He liked them for their simple lives and their honest outspoken affection. They liked him for his directness and frank courtesy. After he returned home he continued his interest in

India, and the friendships made there were maintained and strengthened by correspondence and by those little acts of human loving-kindness in which all Victoria's line abound.

It was difficult to believe during the five years of miserable unrest which followed the Prince's tour that the India of sunshine and loyal affection had turned into a land of gloom and sullen hatred, where the corrupters of youth whispered at every corner and the assassin's hand was ever ready to strike. The bad breeze which stirred India in 1857 was stirring again, and Westminster and Whitehall were as incompetent and incapable to lull it as they were later incapable to lay the spirit of unrest in industrial England. We heard little in England of the real facts of Indian unrest. A dramatic assassination would be telegraphed home, and the end of one of the endless State trials would be reported. But we heard nothing of the atmosphere of hatred and suspicion in which our countrymen and countrywomen daily moved. We heard nothing of Government House being surrounded by secret police, and of high officials being shadowed wherever they went. In Lord Curzon's time Government House was the resort of all classes and colours, where West met East in free and manly comradeship; it became a very Peterhof, a palace of precaution and suspicion.

Then it was that the King decided to go to India. Statesmen and the members of his own family tried to dissuade him. They urged that there was risk of assassination, that India was seething with disaffection, that the time was unpropitious for leaving England, and that the heavy labours of the coronation ceremonies called for some respite and some leisure. But the King determined to face all risks, and his persistent resolve gradually beat down opposition from kinsfolk and Cabinet.

We do not propose to follow the King through his marvellous triumph in India, to describe the warmth of welcome in Bombay, the pomp of Delhi, the spiritual effervescence of the crowds of Calcutta. It was in the last-named city that the King's greatest success was achieved. Calcutta, the second city of the Empire, had earned an evil reputation during the preceding five years, and most of the wise men argued that, though the King might visit Delhi, he ought at all costs to be prevented from going to

Calcutta. But the King's own instinct was right, and the brave and generous impulse which led him to Calcutta sealed for ever the success of the Royal visit.

It has been the fashion for many years past to laugh at Calcutta and to poke fun at the Bengalis—'at the patent 'leather shoes, the silk umbrellas, the thousand-horse-power 'English phrases, and the loose shadows of English thoughts.' We have forgotten that our earliest friends in the Indian Empire were the Bengáli bábus, and have been too apt to extol at their expense the virtues of the more martial races of the north. But the Bengalis did not forget the former relationship, and maddened by the wound to their pride of race, rather than by unrealised ambitions of political power, they turned. The partition of Bengal served the purpose of a flag to rally the Bengali-speaking people, and to the surprise of an astonished India the extremists of Bengal crossed the Rubicon, and avowed their hatred of the British Government. When the Indian moves and acts, it is difficult to get him back. Repression sometimes avails, and concession sometimes may serve. But the two together do not make for lasting peace, and there would have been no peace in unhappy Bengal and unrestful India if the King had not come.

There are no people in the world so courteous and so kind as the Indians, or so responsive to kindness. They were impressed by the fact that the King and Queen, after a year of almost incessant royal and social functions, had determined to undertake the long journey to India, and to face the heavy burden of the ceremonies which the East demands so punctiliously and so rigorously. They were immensely gratified too that India had been selected in preference to one of the overseas Dominions. Their King Emperor had not forgotten them, had not forgotten their enthusiastic tribute of affection when he visited them before. He was an old friend coming back to them, coming to them when the world was looking coldly and suspiciously on their activities and restoring to them their self-respect.

For these reasons the Bengalis, as well as the other races and peoples of India, hailed the advent of the King, and in their affection and gratitude these Irishmen of the East were as exuberant in their loyalty to him as they had been conspicuous in their antagonism to his Government.

There were many who held that the King's visit to India unaccompanied by boons and concessions would prove a disappointment and a failure; but they were arguing from a Western standard. In the East the idea is everything, it is concrete and a part of life. With us it is an incident and an abstraction. And one of the ideas of India, as old as India itself, is the idea of Kingship. It would be difficult to bring home to our readers the enormous power of this idea. It holds and compels all classes in India. It is the most sacred tenet of their religion, and an ever-present sanction of their social life, as all who witnessed the pageants at Delhi and the whole-hearted enthusiasm of the crowds in Calcutta can well understand. Those who are responsible for the Government of India and for the maintenance of British rule ought to realise that the greatest asset in the administration of the Indian Empire is the King. The millions of India would have received their Emperor with joy and affection even though he had come to them bearing no gifts and offering no boons. His presence was sufficient, a token and a sign of sympathy and personal goodwill.

At Delhi the people saw their Emperor. They saw him silhouetted against the glorious Eastern sky in the great coronation arena, and they watched him later in his robes and crown as he sat in silence looking down from the marble palace of the Moghuls on the thousands who stood gazing upwards from the greensward along the Jumna river. This vision of their Sovereign counted for more than all the decrees, concessions, and rewards announced at the Durbar.

But in the decrees there was one which will profoundly affect the future of India. The announcement that the capital should be moved from Calcutta to Delhi came as a surprise to everyone. The secret had been well guarded. The time and place were well chosen. And those who had feared that the coronation ceremony would be an historic failure for want of some signal and dramatic announcement, felt as they listened to the decree that this was action indeed. Kubla Khan decreed 'a stately pleasure dome' in Xanadu, and the great Moghuls moved their capital with the same indifference as they would strike their camp on a royal progress. But in the twentieth century to move the capital of India, to leave rich, proud Calcutta, with her palaces and her offices, her docks and her

railways, her merchants and her lawyers, was a far more serious matter; and though complaint may fairly be made of the manner in which so tremendous a move was announced, it must be admitted in defence that if the matter had been submitted to public discussion it would have been hung up indefinitely. Loyal Calcutta, to whose credit it stands that she kept silence during the King's stay, has since broken into protest, and the Bengal Chamber of Commerce has expressed its views upon some aspects of the move to Delhi with considerable but not excessive emphasis. Undoubtedly Calcutta will lose socially, for the officials of the Government of India and the officers of the army headquarters made a brave show in hospitable Calcutta, while the splendid men of the body-guard will no longer grace—on payment—the wedding festivals of the ostentatious Bengali. The tradesman will lose, and the Armenian landlord will for a time miss his exorbitant rents. But it ends there. Calcutta is one of the richest spots in the world, and can easily afford to lose the three months' residence of the Government of India; subject only to one condition, that there must be a sufficient representation of commerce on the Legislative Council of Bengal. On this everything depends. For Calcutta is essentially the city of British merchants and British capital. In Bombay, where the Parsees are predominant, the case is different, but in Calcutta all the larger commerce belongs to British merchants, and they must be protected. In Calcutta and generally throughout Bengal our stake is in immovable property, elsewhere it is in movable property. If it went forth to the world that the great port of Calcutta, with its vast business in jute, tea, and coal, and in other growing industries was at the mercy of the Bengali vote, there would be an instant feeling of insecurity which might prove fatal to the prosperity of Bengal. Therefore, in spite of the clamour which some Bengalis are already beginning to raise against what they call the over-representation of the British element, Lord Hardinge and Lord Crewe must upon this point hold firm. Subject to this condition, we have no apprehensions as to the consequences of the removal of the capital.

On the contrary, great advantages will result from that removal. Not the least of these is the possibility of creating a centre for the social as well as the political life of India as a

whole. Speaking in the House of Lords on the 17th of June last, Lord Curzon said :

'Was it altogether wise to contemplate in the erection of this new capital that it should become a sort of pleasure resort of the Princes of India, thereby taking them away from the responsibilities and duties which were naturally theirs in the States over which they ruled? No one, of course, proposes that the Princes of India should neglect their duties, but even Indian Princes need occasional relaxation and the opportunity of meeting their social peers, and if they could find these opportunities in the capital of India they would be saved the greater expense, the wearisome voyage, and, we may add, speaking from inner knowledge, the boredom of visits to London and Paris. We do not for a moment mean to suggest that it is undesirable that the Princes and Chiefs of India, when they have reached a responsible age, should, from time to time, visit European capitals, and especially London, but we do urge that India herself ought to possess a capital capable of holding its own even with London and Paris in the estimation of all classes in India. People must be amused, and in India there are few amusements for the upper classes, and, with the exception of the old religious fairs, none for the million. For these reasons, the new capital of India must be a city of pleasaunces, of vast and beautiful parks and gardens, to attract the golden youth of India. There must be aerodromes and racecourses, a lake for boating, and the best polo and cricket grounds in the East. And in the first instance everything must be planned out by the Government, or at least the lines laid into which future plans can be fitted. We cannot afford to be mediocre in this new Delhi, and we must afford to be liberal.

'Lord Hardinge, to whom will fall the task of laying out the ground for what should be the most remarkable city in the world, has, we believe, estimated the cost at four millions sterling. We presume that this estimate merely provides for the laying out of the new city, the engineering works, the water supply and other services, and the barracks for the cantonments which will surround the enclave. Four millions will not build the new Government House, the Council House, the public offices, and the residences of the officials. In the Imperial City there must be colleges, museums and libraries. There must also be a Cathedral Church worthy of the English people, and built, we hope, like the Cathedral at Khartoum, by subscriptions raised in England. There must be hospitals, which will be models for the rest of India. Everything must be nobly and grandly conceived. Science and engineering skill must be invoked to render the Bazaars immune from plague, cholera and malaria. Delhi should be an object-lesson to the whole of India, and if the cost should amount, as we believe it will, to five times Lord Hardinge's original estimate, it will be money well spent. The city will not be finished for another twenty years, and in India twenty

years is a long time, for the span of Indian life is half that of the Western span. So we are building for posterity, a posterity which will be far richer than the present, far more critical and more exacting.

'It would be wrong, however, to stint railway extension and the great works of irrigation even for the sake of the new Delhi. Already railway extension is so gravely handicapped by the finance and methods of the Government of India that only fourteen miles of new line are to be undertaken in the current year; while there is constant clamour among the commercial classes for improved equipment of the old lines which the Government fails to supply. But if the finance of Delhi is mixed up with the general finance of India, the tendency will be either to starve productive work or to stop building at Delhi and incidentally to conceal the real cost of the new city. However much it may temporarily affect Indian credit in London, the new Delhi should be built by a loan, repayable by annuities extending over some thirty years, so that Delhi may rise from the rocks despite possible interruptions from famine and war.'

But it will be asked why, if the prospects are so attractive, does the well-informed writer whose name stands at the head of this article protest so strongly? We can only reply that it is not always easy, even for the shrewdest observers, to shake off the prepossessions of their upbringing. Mr. Lovat Fraser graduated in India at a time when the Government of India, that most wonderful achievement of our race, had been brought to its zenith of perfection by Lord Curzon; and, as an enthusiastic admirer of that great Viceroy, he could hardly be expected to approve of a decree which cancelled the crowning act of the Curzon administration—the partition of Bengal. Nor has Mr. Fraser perhaps sufficiently realised the change which took place after Lord Curzon's departure. His mantle fell on less strenuous shoulders, and it has become impossible to maintain the centralised system of administration with which the Government of India has so long been identified. When the Government of India is weak, decentralisation sets in, and it is quite possible that, even if the King's decree had never been published, that Government would have fallen by its own weight and its own weakness. It had grown to such a size, so heavy and so ponderous, that its contact with the Provincial Governments was crushing and paralysing to them. The Viceroy with his executive council—two of whom came out direct from Whitehall and were absolutely ignorant of India

when they were appointed—with their secretaries and departments give sailing orders to every Government and every official in India. The officials who form the Government of India come from the provinces, ripe in detailed provincial knowledge, but rarely masters of principle. Often they are too ripe—too old and too tired—to take up new ideas. For the most part they remain provincial, and their very knowledge of provincial detail is a hindrance and a clog on the development and growth of the local governments. In a word, the local governments are forced, irrespective of climate, country, race and religion, to march on in the groove which the Government of India prescribes. And it is always easier to prescribe one groove than many grooves. The need for decentralisation has long been admitted, and four years ago a Decentralisation Commission was appointed by that acme of centralisation, the India Office. It travelled up and down India asking questions, and finally issued a voluminous report. So far little action has been taken upon that report, though, independently of the Commission's labours, centrifugal action has already set in. It is possible, however, that the old Government of India might have lingered on for many years, the butt of provincial wits and the milch-cow for provincial finance, had not the King come to Delhi, and—perhaps unconsciously—cut the Gordian knot which had baffled so many reformers, who dreamed of decentralisation but never realised their dream.

One thing is certain, that the Government of India, as men knew it in Lord Curzon's time, passed away for ever when Lord Hardinge left the old home of the Viceroys in Calcutta. The day of the Provincial Governments has now come. They too in Eastern fashion will walk in grooves, but there will be many grooves instead of one groove, and the drab monotony of the Indian administration will give place to a more healthy and stimulating variety of experiment. A glance at the map of India, a moment's consideration of the population and the trade statistics, will suggest the thought that the Provincial Governments will have more than they can do. That is largely true, and if the old standard of efficiency be exacted, the Governments of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay will in turn pay the penalty of greatness and come under decentralising influences.

Thus the departure from Calcutta is not a mere change of residence—a hasty resolution to emigrate to a less crowded centre, or a sudden craving for fresh fields : it is an outward and visible sign of an inward and overpowering tendency. Decentralisation is a necessity, and decentralisation was impossible as long as the capital of the Viceroy was located in the capital of one of the Provinces. The whole position is admirably summed up in Lord Crewe's despatch, which he has in substance re-affirmed in the House of Lords while repudiating the extravagant gloss put upon his language by some of the Indian papers :—

' It is certain, in the course of time, the just demands of Indians for a larger share in the government of the country will have to be satisfied, and the question will be how this devolution of power can be conceded without impairing the supreme authority of the Governor-General in Council. The only possible solution of the difficulty would appear to be gradually to give the Provinces a larger measure of self-government, until at last India would consist of a number of administrations, autonomous in all provincial affairs, with the Government of India above them all, and possessing power to interfere in case of misgovernment, but ordinarily restricting their functions to matters of Imperial concern.'

We see no reason to object to these words, even if, as Mr. Lovat Fraser puts it, they ' suggest specifically the coming ' virtual abdication by the Government of India of much of ' their present authority.' It is true that the machinery of government in India is so devised that the supreme authority cannot now restrict itself to ' matters of Imperial concern ' without further revolutionary changes.' But our argument is that the machinery is too complicated for the new race of men who have been trying to manipulate it with unskilled and hesitating hands. ' Supreme authority ' flitted over the sea to Whitehall some years ago. The Government of India has become the mere mouthpiece of the Secretary of State, and its functions must therefore be strictly limited. It was difficult enough to supervise from Calcutta or from Simla the detailed government of the whole of India. Lord Morley's transference of the centre of authority to London involved either a revolutionary change of system or the breakdown of the British connexion. The revolution, which is now on the way to accomplishment, is the creation of a number of centres

of real authority in place of the one centre which had already been shifted from Calcutta to London.

This revolution involves the scrapping of much of the present machinery of the Government of India, and the restriction of the activities of that Government to certain functions which must be centralised for the benefit of India as a whole. These include the whole subject of defence and the external relations of India. They also include the relations between British India and the Native States. They include the control of the Customs Department, of the Post Office and Telegraphs, and also some co-ordinating control over the railway system of the peninsula, though it is highly desirable that the Provincial Governments should be more consulted with regard to railway matters than has hitherto been the case. But we see no reason why the Government of India should continue to concern itself with education or agriculture or forestry or even with commerce. These are matters which ought to be left in the hands of the Provincial Governments, and the vexed question of the location of the new Imperial Department of Commerce should be settled by abolishing that Department altogether, except so far as it deals with postal and railway matters, and leaving the Governments of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras to establish commercial departments of their own—if they think it worth while to do so.

It is not, however, sufficient to divest the Government of India of many of its present functions; in addition, that Government must be completely re-constituted. The present Viceregal system has broken down. A Viceroy, even when the work of decentralisation is completed, would still have more than enough responsibility for one man. He would be necessarily so busy with official responsibilities that social duties would continue to suffer. No country can live happily and healthily in the rarefied atmosphere of officialdom. With all the good intentions in the world, a Viceroy has not time to think of the little things that count, and the little courtesies which mean so much to the courteous and punctilious people of India. Often he has not been trained in that way—he is not to the manner born.

There is another consideration which is in some ways even more important. The facility of inter-communication between

England and India has enabled prominent Indians, including both hereditary princes and democratic politicians, to go behind and beyond the Viceroy in dealing with the Government and the people of Great Britain. The great princes of India are received at home with the courtesy and honour which is their due ; they return to India and contrast their rank with that of a Viceroy who has possibly been promoted from a Government office and received a peerage *ad hoc*. At the same time, the politicians get into touch with Members of Parliament, and are invited to confidential conferences with the Secretary of State. From both points of view the people of India have learnt that the Viceroy is not so great a personage as he once seemed : he is merely, in Mr. Montagu's unwisely frank phrase, ' the agent of the Secretary of State.' This situation cannot continue. It involves a constant slight upon the legitimate pride of the Indian peoples ; and, though English Radicals, with their hereditary faith in the fetish of representative government, may not be aware of the fact, the average Indian—and perhaps also the average European—attaches far more importance to the preservation of his self-respect than to the opportunity of dropping a piece of paper at rare intervals into a ballot box. Men who know India know that the real cause of unrest there is social rather than political. That is why the King's visit has achieved so much. It has in effect lifted the people of India on to a new plane : it has made them feel no longer the subjects of English people, but fellow-subjects with English people of one King. Simultaneously, and even before the coming of the King, it is gratifying to be able to record that there was in progress a spontaneous movement towards better social relationship between the natives of India and the natives of England, based upon a growing feeling of mutual respect.

In this connexion the ugliest rock ahead lies outside India. Not only do the self-governing Colonies by their anti-Indian legislation habitually wound the pride of every self-respecting Indian, but latterly we have seen a movement growing at home for the exclusion of Indian Lascars from British ships. This movement, though obviously inspired by trade-union jealousy, has assumed a most offensive racial form, and though at present it is confined to a particular group of trade-unionists, we in India can never be confident that it

may not in the near future secure the approval of some British ministry cadging for the Labour vote.

Such a risk is all the greater in view of the present system of governing India. The Secretary of State, who possesses supreme authority and exercises it to interfere in every detail of Indian administration, is primarily a member of a British Cabinet. His political life depends on maintaining peace with his colleagues in the Cabinet and the members of his party in the House of Commons, and if the interests of India stand in the way of this primary need the interests of India are sacrificed. He usually has no first-hand knowledge of Indian problems, and—as recent experience has shown—he allows himself to be guided by the advice of the permanent officials of the India Office, most of whom have never been beyond Whitehall, in preference to that of the India Council consisting of men who have spent the greater part of their lives in India. Neither source of advice is satisfactory, for the permanent officials have little or no conception of what may be called the 'atmosphere' of India, and the retired Anglo-Indians who serve upon the Council remember the India of their youth, which is not the India of their retirement. It is, if possible, even more important to diminish the work of the Secretary of State than to diminish that of the Government of India.

The greater part of the expensive establishment in Whitehall should be swept away. Its cost is a constant matter of complaint in India, and forms the one solid basis for native and Keir-Hardian rhetoric about the 'drain' of India's resources for the benefit of England. In particular, the Stores Department of the India Office is an absolute anachronism. The Government of India and the Provincial Governments are fully competent to buy all the European stores they require either directly from European firms or indirectly from firms established in Calcutta and Bombay. There is a widespread suspicion in India that the Stores Department of the India Office, with its expensive staff for which India pays, is maintained for no other purpose than to enable the Secretary of State to give preferential treatment to certain influential English firms. We are willing to believe that this suspicion is entirely unfounded. But the fact that it exists is alone a reason for abolishing the Department. England in her

relations with India must not only be just but must also appear so.

We have in a word to get away altogether from the traditions established by the East India Company, traditions derived from the fact that the Company was founded for the very purpose of earning out of India a profit for English shareholders. In place of this conception, which in theory disappeared altogether when Queen Victoria took over the direct sovereignty of India in 1858, we have to substitute the conception which regulates the relations between the self-governing Dominions and the Home Government. The relationship cannot be absolutely the same, for the stupendous racial and religious differences in India make democratic self-government on the Colonial model impossible. But the responsible officials on the spot, both English and Indian, aided and checked as they now are by representative councils and by a very active public opinion, are perfectly capable of carrying on all the detailed work of governing India without the assistance or the interference of Whitehall. It is a gross indignity to the people of India that decisions which have been reached on the spot by competent men with full cognisance of the facts, which have been thoroughly discussed in the public press as well as in official files, and which are purely local in their bearing, cannot be put into operation until they have been sent home for the scrutiny of some unknown clerk in a top room at the India Office, who in practice wields the authority of the Secretary of State.

In order to break down this vicious system and the equally vicious over-centralisation of the Government of India, a complete new departure is necessary. We are convinced that the only way of fully meeting the real needs of India, both governmental and sentimental, is to make one of the Princes of the Royal House the representative of the Sovereign in India, with a high official to act under him as Dewán or Prime Minister.

A Royal Viceroy or Prince Regent, a *Khandáni ádmi*, one of the blood, would stand out as the source of honour, the arbiter of social sanctions, the protector and champion of immemorial rights and privileges, which to the Indians are as the breath of life. There would be continuity, for the Prince Regent would remain, and the short uncertain friendships of the five years' tenure of Viceroyalty would give way to the abiding link of a

longer period. The Indian hates change and distrusts the stranger. He is dazed by the State kaleidoscope. It is too rapid for him. He sees the beauties of the rapidly succeeding Viceroys with blurred and unappreciative eyes. It would rest his vision if he could look on something more permanent, on someone whom he could claim as his friend, someone who knows him. More than half the unrest of India is due to the fact that the official changes are so frequent. India yearns for familiar faces.

Even more important is the gratification which such a change would give to Indian pride. In a fitful way India is longing to come within the comity of the nations. Her Princes come to England to be welcomed in the best society, admired for their dignified manners, their splendid horsemanship, their gorgeous dresses, and they go back as some Mahomedans go back from Mecca. Much of the resulting disappointment and bitterness of heart would be avoided if there were a Prince Regent who would serve as a link between India and England, who would act as the great social interpreter between two civilisations moving in such widely different shades of thought. This work cannot be done by the officials of the Government of India. They have accomplished much; they have made fine and lasting bricks with very little straw; they have made the continent safe and prosperous. But they have had no time for the social side of life. All their work has been official, and though Indians and Englishmen work splendidly together both in the army and the civil service, there will not be an adequate sense of social and civic comradeship until India has a Prince Regent as the visible embodiment of the fact that Englishmen and Indians are subjects of one sovereign. If we, prosaic, dull Englishmen, need a King or a member of the Royal Family to start a Hospital Fund, to inspire a University, or to vitalise a charity, a thousand times more do the Indians want a social leader and a guide.

No Viceroy has been or can be such a guide. He has no leisure. He is an official hemmed in and guided by officials. He looks upon his visitors mainly as the outcrop of official files. He has no time for anything but the formal visit and the begrudged return. He is thankful to get it over, and to shake off the scent of the *attar* and to hand the *pán* to the corrupt

lictor in red. It is a pitiful waste of time and opportunity, but the Viceroy has to get back to his files and his secretaries. And so the weary five years pass and bored India wonders what the next Viceroy will be like. He will be very much like the others. It is merely a choice between King Stork and King Log, and both are uncomfortable.

The substitution of a Royal Prince, with quasi-permanent tenure of office, for a flitting Viceroy would produce at once a complete change, not only by satisfying the legitimate and entirely worthy desire of Indians for fuller social recognition in their own country, but also by improving India's outlook upon the world. A Prince Regent would act as the champion and interpreter of the growing desire of the East for toleration and fair play in the West. He would plead with greater force than any official, however distinguished, for the removal of the racial stigma which now rests upon the kindly and courteous peoples of India. We cannot of course expect that economic jealousy would necessarily disappear, but it would no longer to the same extent as at present be overlaid and disguised by expressions of race prejudice which are all the more bitter to bear because in many cases they are a mere cloak for other motives.

The black cloud of unrest that had been hanging over India for five years, ever gathering in deepness, disappeared in an instant before the sunshine of Delhi. But it may return if the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of India are checked, and their self-respect persistently wounded. The King has prepared the way for peace and good feeling. He has given an immense impetus to the idea of decentralisation, by recognising the necessary revolt from a too highly centralised Government, out of harmony and out of touch with Indian sentiment. The decrees at Delhi involve the creation of strong Provincial Governments, whose existence will render possible the healthy and varied growth of the widely different elements which make up the great continent of India.

Finally, the King's visit may fairly be regarded as the first step towards the great constitutional reform indicated in the preceding pages, the appointment of a Prince Regent as the King's representative in India to discharge the social and ceremonial functions of the Viceroy's office, with a Dewán or Prime Minister to carry on the Viceroy's

administrative work. The Prince Regent will be in close contact with the chiefs and leading families of India, and on his frequent tours he will learn the opinions, the hopes, and the ambitions of the various provinces. He will save the Prime Minister from the fatigue of the long journeys and from the dislocation of work which is caused by the present Viceregal tours. And at the same time, he will bring back with him to the capital first-hand information which will be of great value to the administration ; for it will be information given freely and unofficially. It will be the business of the Prime Minister to correlate the activities of the Provincial Governments, to control Imperial finance and Imperial legislation. But, with the change that is coming, legislation will tend to become provincial, and laws of Imperial scope should become the exception.

We believe that the change of system here sketched out is the necessary consequence of changes in thought and circumstance which have been rapidly maturing, and which, unless their course be guided, will sweep over India with the destructive force of a river in flood.

THE CAUSES OF CHINESE UNREST

1. **Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East.** By PAUL S. REINSCH. Constable. 1912.
2. **Ruins of Desert Cathay.** By M. AUREL STEIN. Macmillan and Co. 2 vols. 1912.
3. **The Changing Chinese.** By Professor E. A. Ross. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
4. **China.** By Sir ROBERT K. DOUGLAS. New and revised edition. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
5. **The China Year Book.** By H. T. MONTAGUE BELL and H. G. W. WOODHEAD. George Routledge and Sons, Ltd. 1912.
6. **The Civilisation of China.** By Professor H. A. GILES. Williams and Norgate. 1911.
7. **The West in the East.** By PRICE COLLIER. Duckworth and Co. 1911.
8. **Peace or War East of Baikal.** By E. J. HARRISON. Kelly and Walsh, Ltd., Yokohama. 1910.
9. **Descriptive Sociology of the Chinese,** compiled, in accordance with Herbert Spencer's classification and arrangement. By E. T. C. WERNER. Edited by H. R. TEDDER. Williams and Norgate. 1910.

IF it were possible, by means of some international agency or Carnegie Court, to take out Life Insurance policies for nations, and if these national applicants were required to supply precise information regarding their ancestry, the evolution of their social state, their transmitted tendencies and acquired habits, China would doubtless be passed as a 'good life' because of her long-tested vitality, but the premium on her policy would be a high one, by reason of her increasing tendency to dangerous forms of excess and to certain symptoms of organic disturbance. Under the actual conditions of the problem a social scientist, called in to advise on China's case, could only rely upon general surmisings, uninformed by accurate data concerning the nation's early history and processes of development; for the Chinese, like the Hindoos, have ever been peculiarly lacking in historic consciousness. The annals and records of successive dynasties provide little or no material for critical or scientific study of the evolution of the nation's laws, institutions and culture. The store-room of the Chinese race's past is a dark lumber place, full of archaic

rubbish, ancient myths and ghostly whisperings ; we search it in vain for the cradle, the childhood's toys, the school books and discarded garments of former days. And since it is only within the last century that this primordial elder brother of the human race has been brought to speaking terms with the outside world, our estimate of his earlier intellectual and political struggles is largely conjectural. Moreover, it has been subjected to many distorting influences, not the least of which has been the hypnotic effect of Chinese literature and philosophy upon the minds of those European scholars and observers who have studied and reflected that teaching.

The scientific interpretation of sociological phenomena, by the accumulation and critical comparison of groups of facts, and by the tracing back of proximate causes to those more remote, presupposes continuous and fairly trustworthy historical records. In their absence, something of the structural development of a nation may be traced in its monuments and archæological relics ; M. Aurel Stein has shown what may be done in this direction by his researches and discoveries in the buried cities of desert Cathay. But the social and historical data required to enable us to reconstruct and understand the gradual evolution of China's social system, data of the kind collected by Herbert Spencer as the basis of his 'Descriptive Sociology,' are not at present available ; nor, indeed, has any investigation of the country's existing phenomena been made upon systematic methods of observation and deduction. The practical value of such investigations has been conclusively demonstrated in recent years by the work of French social economists, and notably in the writings of Edmond Demolins and Léon Poinsard ; but the field in China is so vast, the difficulties of accurate observation so many and formidable, that the individual and independent efforts of a few enthusiasts have produced but little result. Mr. E. T. C. Werner's 'Descriptive Sociology of the Chinese,' published by the Herbert Spencer Trustees, purports, it is true, to describe 'the morphology, the physiology and 'the development' of China's civilisation. It is a monumental work, containing extracts from eight hundred Chinese authors and 238 European writers, but the evidence of this cloud of witnesses is vitiated as much by what Spencer would call the subjective states of the European observers, as by the Orientals'

own lack of historic sense. Amidst much irrelevant matter, compiled by Chinese annalists, and many contestable inferences from the incomplete or biassed observations of Europeans, the student of social science can gather but little valid evidence to justify any definite conclusions. The chief conclusion to be drawn from China's historical records tends, indeed, to justify Froude's opinion, that history does not provide subject matter for science. In endeavouring to determine what are the laws of the natural forces at work in China's social system, and what their ascertained effects, we are therefore driven back upon first principles, and upon such general conclusions as may reasonably be based upon the exact knowledge acquired during the last half-century.

Examination of the books published about China and the Chinese since the outbreak of the Revolution last October, as well as the opinion of European journalists now resident in that country, reveals a very general growth and consensus of opinion on two subjects—firstly, that the time-honoured conception of a wide gulf, moral and intellectual, between East and West is gradually fading into the limbo of exploded shibboleths; secondly, that the Chinese race has witnessed, or is about to witness, the beginning of a new era, the dawn of a new day. As regards the first of these subjects, it is interesting to look back to the early days of European observation of the Chinese, and to see how clearly defined was the idea that no accurate conception of the Chinese individual or national character could be formed by the Western mind. 'Some day, perhaps,' wrote Mr. Wingrove Cooke, 'Times' Correspondent in 1858, 'we may acquire the necessary know-'ledge to give to each of the glaring inconsistencies of a 'Chinaman's mind its proper weight and influence in the 'general mass.' To the Jesuit missionaries of the seventeenth century the Chinese were an utterly incomprehensible race, to be reclaimed only by the grace of Providence and the Christian religion. But the observers of to-day are coming to the opinion that human nature is much the same all the world over, that the great brotherhood of man is something more than a name, and that differences of customs, traditions and social systems act only as barriers between nations because of the common human weakness of measuring other people's actions and conditions by the standard of our own habits and

prejudices. Thus we find Professor Reinsch, one of the latest writers on the intellectual activities of the Far East, observing that ' the conventional and vulgar antithesis of the ' Orient and the West, with its sharp delineation of contrasts, ' has been altogether misleading.' The fact is that, in the state of general knowledge existing fifty years ago, it was difficult for the European in China to appreciate a mental state so different from his own, and to sympathise with the actions and conditions resultant from that state. Therefore, in our earlier geographies and text-books, China figured generally as a sort of fantastic topsy-turvy land, a land of pagodas and pigtails and porcelain, where people ate birds' nests and chow-dogs, where merchants and missionaries struggled eternally with elusive mandarins, against a background of willow-pattern serenity chequered by periodic cataclysms. The Chinaman, as an individual, was regarded as a bundle of hopeless contradictions, much in the same way as good Scotchmen hold the Irish to be troublesome and wayward children. The East and West of Mr. Rudyard Kipling were doomed to be eternally divided, to watch each other for ever and ever, mysterious and menacing shadows, from opposite sides of a great gulf. Remembering how strongly this opinion impressed itself for many years upon our policies and our literature, there is food for thought, and perhaps for cynicism, in the suddenness with which we have become conscious of the fact that nothing essential now divides East from West, and that, to quote one of Professor Reinsch's typical conclusions, ' by profoundly influencing each other, ' they will both contribute their share in developing the ' all-human civilisation of the future.' The Confucian maxim that ' Within the Four Seas all are brethren ' has suddenly asserted itself simultaneously with the birth of new political aspirations in the Orient, and it is supported by many European writers in conclusions framed on lines of more or less systematic observation. Amongst the writers of the previous generation the Spencerian attitude was rare (Baber, Meadows and von Richthofen are notable exceptions), and their observations, as a rule, were based on the assumption of inherent and ineradicable differences of human nature between East and West. It may be that the appearance in China of dynamiters and suffragettes, and other evidences of mankind's common

instincts and common destiny, have helped to modify the observer's standpoint; at all events, the present unanimity is remarkable. Nearly all the writers of to-day recognise the necessity for close and systematic study of the social and intellectual life of the East as the first essential towards a good understanding by and with the West. Mr. E. J. Harrison, in 'Peace or War East of Baikal,' confesses that 'when one 'comes to understand the underlying motives of Oriental 'thought, one sees, often enough, that the logic of the situation 'is not entirely on the side of the Westerner.' Professor E. A. Ross, after half a year of travel and inquiry in the Far East, scoffs at 'the old China hand's' conception of the Chinese as inscrutable mysteries.

'The fact is,' he says, 'to the traveller who appreciates how different is the mental horizon that goes with another stage of culture or another type of social organisation than his own, the Chinese do not seem very puzzling. Allowing for differences in outfit of knowledge and fundamental ideas, they act much as we should act under their circumstances. The theory, dear to literary interpreters of the Orient, that owing to diversity in mental constitution the yellow man and the white man can never comprehend or sympathise with one another, will appeal little to those who from their comparative study of societies have gleaned some notion of what naturally follows from isolation, the acute struggle for existence, ancestor worship, patriarchal authority, the subjection of women, the decline of militancy, and the ascendancy of scholars.'

Dr. Arthur Smith, in the Introduction to the latest edition of 'Chinese Characteristics,' sees 'no apparent reason why 'what is actually known of the Chinese people should not be 'co-ordinated as well as any other combination of complex 'phenomena.' In all these opinions we may perceive a definite movement towards systematic sociological observation and critical comparison. This laudable movement, however, is, as yet, greatly lacking in historic perspective and prevision; a fact indicated by the equally common consensus of opinion which confidently asserts the dawn of a new era with the Chinese Revolution. Philosophically considered, the introduction into China of Western education, the pressure on her economic resources exercised with ever-increasing intensity by Western nations and by Japan, and the elimination of the central authority of the Manchus, are new facts of the highest importance, which must continue, as permanent forces, to

modify the national character and to affect its future movements; but it should be no less obvious that nations, like individuals, must reap what they have sown; that the sins of the fathers are indeed visited upon the children, and that, by no incantation of new formulæ, can their penalties be avoided. The assumption that runs through most of the books and articles written about China since the professed conversion of the Empress Dowager to the idea of Constitutional government in 1902, the theory upon which have been based the policies of our diplomats and financiers since the collapse of the Manchu dynasty, postulates belief in a sudden and radical transformation of all the social and political institutions of the Chinese people. In the twinkling of an eye, it seems, they have been changed. All the immemorial instincts and impulses, the well-worn ways of thought and action of this, the oldest civilisation on earth, are to pass, we are told, with the passing of the Manchus, by the magic of the blessed word Republic, and the waving of a five-coloured rag.

It is no new delusion, this vision of a race shedding its inherited tendencies like a garment; nevertheless, history and science alike insist on the fact that the modification of human nature, by the introduction of new factors in its environment, is essentially a slow and laborious process. European history is strewn with the wrecks of enthusiastic schemes for the regeneration of humanity by shibboleths, for making nations moral or great by Act of Parliament.

'If,' says Herbert Spencer, 'we glance over the programmes of societies and sects and schools of all kinds, we find in them one common trait. They are all pervaded by the conviction, now definitely expressed, and now taken as a self-evident truth, that there needs but this kind of instruction or that kind of discipline, this mode of repression or that system of culture, to bring society into a very much better state. . . And yet the delusiveness of such hopes is obvious enough to anyone not blinded by a hypothesis or carried away by an enthusiasm.'

And, in another place,

'Again and again for three generations has France been showing to the world how impossible it is essentially to change the type of a social structure by any rearrangement wrought out through a revolution. However great the transformation may for a time seem, the original thing reappears in disguise. Out of the nominally free government set up a new despotism arises, differing from the

old by having a new shibboleth and new men to utter it; but identical with the old in the determination to put down opposition and in the means used to this end. . . . The bureaucratic system persists equally under Imperialist, Constitutional and Republican arrangements. . . . It needs but to recall the truth, that the properties of the aggregate are determined by the properties of the unit, to see at once that so long as the characteristics of citizens remain substantially unchanged, there can be no substantial change in the political organisation which has slowly been evolved by them.'

The leaders of Young China prefer to put their trust in the dreams of Jean-Jacques Rousseau; nevertheless these pregnant words of a master-thinker might have been written expressly for their learning. For there is this difference to be noted between Rousseau's disciples of the National Convention and the Chinese Republicans, that the latter have, so far, been conspicuously deficient in what Lord Morley defines as the 'earnest enthusiasm for all the purposes, interests and details 'of productive industry' of the French Encyclopædists. With Diderot and his followers, philosophy became patriotism of a practical kind, attaching importance to science and art, as distinct from book-learning, and sympathising instinctively with the farmer, the merchant and the artisan; all forms, in fact, of fruitful labour. It was this practical reality in the French which, despite their political shibboleths, despite the chaos of the Revolution, made and kept the nation great. In so far as their revolutionary movement was characterised by the constructive purpose of maintaining conditions of fruitful labour, it became, indeed, the basis of a new structure of society and, philosophically recognising the realities of life, an effective bond of brotherhood. We have recently seen, and shall yet see, in Persia and Turkey, in Portugal and Mexico, the rise of new despotisms, under Constitutional and Republican rearrangements of systems unmodified by structural change; and in their history, on a small scale, we may read the lesson that China's speculative theorists and political agitators have yet to learn.

Thus considered, the Chinese Revolution and the expulsion of the Manchus appear to be nothing more than aggravated symptoms of the general disorganisation and chronic unrest prevailing throughout the nation's political life. As for the proximate causes of this disorganisation and unrest, it is

absurd to ascribe them to any deliberate and conscious effort by the nation as a whole to adapt itself to a changing environment, or to believe in any deep-rooted influence on the masses of the revolutionary doctrines of Treaty Port journalists and students from Japan. These new factors are producing a certain effect upon the life and thought of the people, no doubt ; but their action must be followed by reaction in due course, and only after the lapse of several generations will it be possible to determine their final effects upon the social structure of China. The error into which have fallen many observers, misled by laudable enthusiasms, is fairly exemplified by the attitude of 'Putnam Weale,' who, in the 'Daily Telegraph' of the 9th of April, expresses his belief in the possibility of such a miraculous transformation 'only because China is 'the home of Aladdin's wonderful lamp.' Writers who take this point of view have no difficulty in persuading themselves that autocracy, opium and anti-militarism have been entirely abolished, 'the whole ancient system effectively wiped out,' and that the Chinese race has divested itself of these things as easily as the student has cut off his queue, and has assimilated European methods and ideas as readily as its bowler hats and frock-coats.

To accept such an interpretation of the present situation in China it is necessary to assume, for the Chinese people as a whole, definite aspirations and fixed goals, an all-pervading instinct of patriotism, subordination of individual to national interests, and authoritative leaders. Of these, there has been no evidence. If history teaches that the man comes with the hour, it teaches also that the hour comes, not by accident, but only after long years of preparation. In the China of to-day we seek in vain for signs of the Idea, universal in appeal, which makes for regeneration, the Idea that impels masses of mankind, at their appointed hour, to follow a Mahomet or a Peter the Hermit, a Garibaldi or a Bolivar. Of a Cromwell, nay, even of a Danton, there is as yet no sign ; nor anything to convince us that, were he to appear, the masses of the people would have ears to hear him.

What then ? Truth compels us, I fear, to the conclusion that the politicians and military conspirators who have succeeded in overthrowing the rule of the Manchus, are themselves all unconscious manifestations of the race's deep-rooted

disease of disorganisation ; that it is not the political agitator who has created unrest, but rather the unrest (chiefly economic in its origin) that has produced the agitator. If we look back through the Chinese annals since the end of the Tang dynasty (or, roughly speaking, since the Norman conquest of England), we find history persistently repeating itself in violent rebellions ; in the ejection, with great slaughter, of dynasties that had exhausted the mandate of Heaven ; in regularly alternating periods of upheaval and recuperation, all traceable, in almost rhythmical series, to a social system which has inculcated principles of passive resistance together with a chronic tendency towards over-population. Intervals of relief from economic pressure have been bought at the price of cataclysms which have depopulated vast regions. Within the memory of living men the whole process has been witnessed—provinces that were laid waste by the Mahomedan and Taiping rebellions have been repeopled in one generation by the surplus of their neighbours, and in the next, have once more been faced by the grim spectre of famine. Even when the needs of the Empire's population as a whole have not exceeded the food supply, there have always been congested districts and overgrown cities, a large percentage of whose inhabitants live literally from hand to mouth. It is from these, the predestined hungry ones, the hopelessly submerged tenth, that are drawn the salt smugglers, beggars, bandits, vagrants and looters who maintain incessant warfare against the rights of property—carrion crows that hover over all fields of fruitful industry—'*les* '*misérables*,' to whom a revolution means the looting of cities and unearned increment. These, in a land where the functions of Government are practically confined to tax-gathering, are the inevitable result of economic pressure on the one hand, and administrative disorganisation on the other. They are the froth and foam of great waves of humanity eternally breaking on the grim rocks of starvation. And, incidentally be it noted, they are the material from which troops are hastily manufactured by both sides in every rebellion and civil war.

These, the outlaws and the desperate, are clearly the offspring of chronic disorganisation ; but its results are by no means confined to the lowest strata of society. The professional political agitator and the bomb-throwing student are, in their

way, equally significant manifestations of the same disease. Socially, they are the direct descendants of those who, under the old classical regime, swarmed in and about every *yamên*, every school and public office in the land, the 'expectants,' the ever-scheming, ever-hungry horde of place-seekers, the submerged and struggling army of the unemployed *literati*. 'Young China,' the leaders of the anti-Manchu and Republican movements, are the sons and brothers of mandarins; and evidence is rapidly accumulating, from Peking to Canton, that, making all possible allowance for the difference between 'Western learning' and the Confucianist classics as surface polish, they remain mandarins by instinct. How, indeed, should they have learned to be anything else?

In saying this I have no wish to pass capital sentence on the mandarin. He, too, is the result of long centuries of petrified tradition, of a creed now outworn. He represents the uses and abuses of a literary bureaucracy which, in its day, served China well, and which, amidst gross corruption and inefficiency, has retained many admirable qualities. But just as the type of the average mandarin has degenerated, becoming corrupt, cowardly and addicted to fleshpots, so, in their descendants who constitute Young China, we find personal ambition, indiscipline and greed, striking a more insistent note than any altruistic appeal of patriotic and fruitful labour.

Not that Young China lacks ardent and unselfish spirits—a movement that produces martyrs of the stamp of Tan Sze-tong, or honestly consistent reformers like Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, can never be quite without hope for the future. But, for the present, for one conscientious reformer like Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, there are a hundred visionaries of the stamp of Káng Yu-wei; for one Tan Sze-tong there are a dozen garrulous, prosperous Wu Ting-fangs. The traditions of the *literati* have never failed to produce an *élite* of great men, earnest, fearless and honest administrators like Liu K'un-yi and Chang Chih-tung, or stern moralists like Wu K'o-tu; but their example has never been able to leaven the lump of mandarin corruption. Even so it is with the latest heirs and assigns of their estate—Young China—bursting with the pride of its Western learning, and freed from the ethical restraints of Confucianism; full of the new wine of Democracy and without the steadying influences

of a philosophy which has preserved the race through countless dangers and tribulations.

To turn to the causes of China's political and social unrest. *Imprimis*, and looking to the present situation, there can be no doubt that the effect of Russia's defeat by Japan, the collapse of the Manchus and the passing of the old-style literary caste, have contributed to the actual ascendency of a new political régime, imbued with all the prestige of that Western knowledge to which Young China attributes the greatness of Japan. (Her centuries of discipline, of loyalty, civic virtues and social cohesion, count for less, in the eyes of China's new leaders, than machinery and rifles and a draft Constitution.) Since the Boxer rising of 1900 it has been clear that an upheaval was impending, for the strong hand of the once virile Manchus had lost its cunning, and without a strong hand no Oriental sovereign can continue to rule. Posts, telegraphs and railways, creating intercommunication between the provinces, had effectively undermined the Manchu position; and they themselves, as the event proved, were quite ready to depart in peace. Since the reign of Hsien Fêng, they had failed to exercise any real authority, and the Empire had passed accordingly through many crises of disorder. In the minds of the masses they had become identified with disaster, with memories of looted cities, desecrations of ancestral tombs, and the ruin of industry and trade. They had exhausted the mandate of Heaven, and their hour was therefore at hand. It has never been the custom of this philosophical race to inquire too closely into the antecedents or proceedings of their rulers. They welcomed the Republican programme of Young China, therefore, with the same cheerful acquiescence, and the same mental reservations, as they welcomed the alien Manchus after the defeat and expulsion of the degenerate native dynasty of the Mings. What the Chinese people, as distinct from the politicians of the Treaty Ports, asks of its rulers (be they who they may) is peace and reasonable security for life and property. The appointed duty of every man is to labour unceasingly, and to leave behind him as many ancestor-worshippers as possible; the duty of rulers is to provide him with peaceful opportunities for so doing. Nevertheless, the very ease and bloodlessness with which the change has been effected are proving, at the outset, additional

factors of unrest. The example of such easy attainment of power and place is not likely to be lost on the secret societies, on the semi-independent military forces in the provinces, on the Cantonese pirates, and other organised bodies of predatory outlaws.

Even if we assume, with the optimists and financiers, that a *modus vivendi* can be found between North and South, between Constitutional Monarchists and Republicans, between civilians and soldiers, between the haves and the have-nots, there must yet remain those persistent causes of disorganisation which lie in the mental state and social structure of the masses—causes removable only by slow educative process. Of these, the chief is the procreative recklessness of the race, that blind frenzy of man-making, born of ancestor-worship and Confucianism, which, despite plague pestilence and famine, battle murder and sudden death, persistently swells the numbers of the population up to, and beyond, the visible means of subsistence. By means of polygamy, early marriages and the interdependence of clans, the Chinese people struggle to fulfil at all costs the inexorable demands of their patriarchal system ; bringing their predestined victims of hunger and disease into a world that has no room for them ; breeding up to a food-limit which, amidst toil and penury incredible, has long since reached the breaking point. A nation which implicitly believes, and unanimously acts on the belief, that a man's first duty in life is to provide as many male heirs as possible for the comfort of himself and of his ancestors, inevitably condemns vast masses of its people to the lowest depths of poverty, and condemns the body politic to regularly recurring cataclysms. The chronic condition of China, except in those districts where plague or famine or civil war has temporarily relieved the pressure, is a struggle for life unequalled in any other part of the world—a struggle so desperate that the fittest who survive must of necessity be endowed with peculiar qualities of physical resistance and vitality. And it is a struggle from which there is, generally speaking, no escape ; for, to add to the burden of philoprogenitiveness, the traditions of the race have decreed, with the force of religion, that it is the duty of every man to sacrifice at stated intervals at his ancestral tombs and to be buried, in due season, with his fathers. Thus the great bulk of the population have for centuries been rigidly localised, and

a people from whom Confucianism has gradually eliminated all instincts of collective initiative, into whom Buddhism has instilled a spirit of passivity and renunciation, has been deprived of the outlets which general emigration and territorial expansion northwards might otherwise have provided. Within their own borders, therefore, they have perished, sacrificed by millions to a social system utterly improvident and callous of human suffering.

It is clear, I think, that herein lies the great and remote cause of China's intolerable afflictions—a cause not to be removed by any political shibboleths or panaceas of philanthropy. Even supposing that, by good government, the conditions of life were to be alleviated for the masses, that by economic reforms and applied science the resources of the country might be materially increased, it is clear that, for a people which rears four generations while Europe is rearing three, with whom the absence of posterity is a crime, and concubinage the reward of success, any relief would be temporary—the fundamental problem deferred, not solved. The immediate result would be a decrease in infant mortality, which at present reaches terrible, almost incredible, proportions. (In Hongkong, under British administration, the death-rate of Chinese children, under one year of age, was eighty-seven per cent. of all births reported in 1909.) A certain percentage of the vagrants and outlaws who infest the outskirts of every city might be reclaimed for the space of one generation ; but the insoluble problem of filling three stomachs with one bowl of rice would speedily have to be faced anew. At this moment a famine is carrying off many thousands from the congested districts of Anhui ; Shensi, though ravaged by the Mahomedan rebellion a generation earlier, lost a third of its inhabitants by famine in 1900. The wastage and slaughter of the Taiping rebellion have been computed at close on a hundred million souls ; the Yellow River floods have periodically carried off their millions of victims. Yet the population to-day stands at about 330 millions, and its pressure is steadily increasing.

During the long centuries of China's seclusion and contempt for the outer barbarian, ever since the time when the Great Wall was built to guard her in self-sufficient isolation, this grim struggle has been going on—man blindly striving to perpetuate the patriarchal pastoral system under conditions economically

impossible. During all these centuries the cause of China's never-ending unrest, of civil wars and ever-recurring anarchy, has been, *au fond*, a strife for food. Here and there the ambitions of rulers and pretenders have set the masses in motion for political ends, but never, as in Europe, have her wars been the result of religious differences, or of the insistent appeal of a moral crusade. The eternal struggle, the same a thousand years ago as it is to-day, grim and silent as the struggle for life in primeval forests, has been for a place in the sun, and for daily bread. No time in all these myriad humble existences for sports or social amenities or amusements; China knows no public recreation grounds, no public interest in art or music, in architecture or poetry. The soul of this people has too long been condemned to elementary materialism, in its business of man-making and man-feeding. Yet this aspect of the situation, this fundamental cause of unrest, is persistently ignored by Monarchists and Republicans alike—no mention of it in all their programmes of reform. To read the discourses of the National Assembly one might think that, by the framing of a Constitution based on the French model, Young China hopes to repeat, *ad infinitum*, the miracle of the loaves and fishes. Yet before their eyes, in the fierce looting of cities, in the activities of Cantonese pirates and northern Hunghutzŭs, in brigandage rampant from Kansuh to the coast, the lesson is writ plain for all to read—that the masses, however pacific and fatalistic by force of tradition, will not long abide quietly under the shadow of starvation unless restrained by the strong hand of armed authority. That is the first object lesson to be learned from the dawn of the Republic's new era, and its development bids fair to eclipse in dramatic features the passing of the Manchu.

During the long ages in which China remained geographically isolated and politically self-sufficient, this thriftless breeding and wholesale destruction of superfluous lives became the established order of existence. The annihilation of millions by flood, famine or disease was generally accepted as part of the common and inevitable destiny of man, 'born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward,' no more to be avoided by any devices of rulers than the devastations of earthquakes and typhoons. But, with the incursions and contact of a more successful civilisation, by the influence of Christian missionaries and the severe

lessons taught by Christian armies, the intelligence of the race has become gradually convinced of error, and deeply wounded in its *amour propre*. It has realised that the profession, if not the practice, of altruism and humanitarianism constitutes a necessary passport to the best society among nations. Indifference to human life, from being a philosophic attitude of acquiescence, has become an offence against modern civilisation. Thus, relief of famine by public subscription, control of the forces of nature by science, plague prevention, the abolition of opium, infanticide and slavery—all these have become part of Young China's programme of reform. Free trade in death must yield to protection for life. But amidst all the disputations of the sects, and all the specifics of political leaders, there has been, as yet, hardly a voice raised against marriages of minors or against polygamy and reckless overbreeding, which are the basic causes of China's chronic unrest.

Another cause, almost as deep-rooted, lies in the absence of any living faith or inspiration of religion among the masses. Confucianism, the soulless system of an intellectual aristocrat, has permeated the national mind, robbing the people's Buddhism of the gentle mysticism, the courage and the reverence which beautify and console the lives of those who still follow the Way in Burmah, in India and Japan. There is the courage of an endurance almost superhuman in the lives of China's toiling millions, but the pathos and the poetry of a religion that redeems other Asiatic races from the heaviest penalties of materialism have been sacrificed, in Confucianism, to the worship of genius, to an ethical system that contents itself with defining man's relations to man and leaves him without enthusiasms, almost without curiosity, for the inner life and the mysteries of worlds unseen. The demons of the Taoists are mocked even by those who, because of superstition, purchase the priests' goodwill. Indifference to things spiritual is the keynote of the Chinese race—an indifference as profound among the 'stupid people' as amongst the *literati*. The unity of the family and the State, the worship of ancestors, the 'five relations' and the paramount duty of labour—these are the unshaken tenets of the Chinaman's creed, the sum and substance of his philosophy and religion. The effects of Western education, even in missionary schools, on the upper classes, reflect the callous agnosticism of the masses; hardly a whisper, in all this

valley of dry bones, of any vivifying breath. The glory that once was China has perished, like that of Greece and Rome, because of the decay of religious faith and worship. The religious revival of the Brahmans, so notable a feature of recent unrest in India, has at present no counterpart in China ; even the Mahomedans of the north-west are followers of the Prophet by tradition rather than by any force of conviction. The faith of the Boxers, the nearest approach to religious enthusiasm that modern China has produced, was like the Christianity of the Taipings—gross superstition, cloaking a fierce hunger for loot. Of religion as a steadying force, to guide the nation through its grievous perils of change, there is practically none ; throughout all the land no voice of preacher, warrior-priest or saint, to create a national conscience and living ideals. A new flag, a national anthem composed by Shanghai journalists, a draft Constitution and vague ambitions of ' astonishing the world ' by miracles of metamorphosis, these are the inspirations and resources of Young China, confronting a great crisis in the nation's history. Of intelligence there is enough and to spare, enough to endow many student leaders with contempt for the foreigner, even as the Bengalis despise the Anglo-Saxon rulers of India. But they have yet to learn in the hard school of experience that (to quote from Professor Wegener) ' the English ' rule India not by their intellectual but by their moral qualities, ' and by the white man's ethical superiority and strength of ' will.' From Yuan Shih-k'ai down to the youngest student of the Dare-to-Die brigade, the absence of purposeful will-power is the most conspicuous characteristic of China's self-appointed leaders.

Yet another fundamental cause of unrest lies in that levelling tendency of China's democratic philosophy, which not only eliminates all effective initiative of leadership, but makes loyalty to a leader the rarest of Chinese virtues. Japanese patriotism, infused with all the chivalry and stoicism of the feudal system, inspired by deep love of country and loyalty to the sovereign, was strong enough to evolve from the clash of systems a people united by definite ideals. Chinese patriotism, is, as yet, but the confused shouting of unstable and untrusted politicians, blind leaders of the blind, without permanent inspiration or consistent purpose. If the dream of the Republic has been accepted by the masses, it has not been

because of any enthusiasm for the persons or principles of its founders, but because, in a people long accustomed to tyrannous misrule, there is always acquiescence in any upheaval with its possible hope of better things. If China possessed either a ruling caste of priests or warriors, or a self-respecting, energetic and staunch *bourgeoisie* to guide the people in the wilderness of new ideas, she would not be confronted with the prospect of long years of disorder, with the misrule and plundering of pretorian bands, more ruthless and undisciplined than those ' whose ' licentious fury was the first symptom and cause of the decline ' of the Roman empire.'

Following upon the fundamental and remote causes of the actual condition of China's social structure, there are other proximate and possibly transient factors, such as, for instance, the recent changes in the educational system ; relaxation of ethical restraints which formerly possessed the force of law ; the widespread corruption of the educated classes ; the disruptive force of new ideas and the absence of authoritative leaders. But every day's experience of the revolutionary movement tends to show that no radical change for the better can possibly be effected except by slow processes of education and religious revival applied through several generations, and that the short cut to Utopia is a vain illusion. It is an illusion common to the highest and lowest forms of civilisation ; in every country every generation believes that it stands at the parting of the ways ' between an old, bad epoch and a good, new one,' hope ever triumphing over experience.

China's civilisation, though callously indifferent to human wastage and wreckage, asserts, by the very antiquity and continuity of its institutions and beliefs, solid claims to our respect. It has survived, and will survive again, invasions of outer barbarians and grave internal disorders, the racial traditions and habits of the masses remaining throughout in all essentials unchanged. Its recuperative strength and its wealth have ever lain in the people's unconquerable energy of labour, in the passive resistance of an instinctively democratic race-spirit, and in atavistic resistance to change. Content with its patriarchal system and patriarchal ideals, it has never evolved a middle class, like the *bourgeoisie* of Western Europe or the *samurai* of Japan, capable of organising, through long periods of preparation, the materials for structural modification.

Until yesterday, there was no reason why it should. The Middle Kingdom had every reason to believe in its own innate superiority ; its scheme of civilisation might well have continued to satisfy its needs had it been possible for China to maintain her splendid isolation. To-day, the economic pressure of the modern world, its *Weltpolitik*, cosmopolitan finance, and quick-firing guns, forbid all hope of her being allowed to resume that ancient and venerable state. The dream cherished by every Chinese official, since the days of Lord Macartney's mission, that we should take away our guns, our opium and our missionaries, and leave China in peace, is clearly impossible of fulfilment.

The foreign-educated Chinese student and the professional politician are among the results of the impact of the West. Undoubtedly, they constitute new and important factors in determining the future direction of social change ; but in considering the present condition of the nation and its immediate future, there is, I think, a tendency to exaggerate the influence which these classes are destined to exercise in modifying the fundamental habits and sentiments of the race. It is easy to be misled, by false analogies taken from the history of Japan, into the common delusion that substantial change can be wrought in the political and social organisation of the country, while yet the character of the masses remains unchanged. Earth's surface is strewn with battered monuments and dead cities which tell us of the passing of races, whose deep-rooted traditions could not be modified in time to cope with the sudden emergence of new and destructive forces. Portugal affords an instance of a country in which chronic unrest has for centuries harassed a laborious and pacific people, because of the belief of its upper class in political formulæ as remedies for national ills, and its failure to apply the slow-working structural changes of education and discipline. Russia's recurring paroxysms of protest against autocracy denote, in their lack of cohesion and continuity, the pathetic efforts of idealists to evolve a modern social structure out of materials largely medieval, to pass in a generation from the feudal system to organised socialism. It is usual in China to cite Japan as an example of what may be done by new laws and new machinery of government, all regardless of the fact that the qualities of will-power, loyalty and sustained energy which enabled Japan to effect in forty years those stupendous changes in her political and economic organ-

isation, were the results of long centuries of self-discipline and patriotism ; oblivious, too, of the fact that the nation's social organisation, its ethics, philosophy and culture, the subtle charm and poetry of the inner life of the people, have retained their own traditions and characteristics. Such cultural and political influences as Japan has assimilated, have been deliberately acquired, and intelligently adapted to the existing structure.

Of India it has been said by a thoughtful observer that if the British Ráj were to be withdrawn to-morrow, the moral effect of two centuries of British influence and example would swiftly fade and utterly disappear. The material monuments would be there—the roads and railways and canals—but the impression upon the thought-life of the people of all our conceptions and expositions of the purposes of existence, would pass like the memory of a dream. The brooding soul of the Asiatic would continue to take its time-honoured way through this valley of illusions, undisturbed by any memories of our fretful materialism and vexatious dogma ; and national customs would speedily reflect again immemorial ideals and beliefs. If this be true of India, how much more so of China, for the masses of whose population European civilisation looms only on the remoter horizons of imagination, a vague and menacing peril !

If, looking to the ancient and permanent foundations of the Chinese social structure on the one hand, and to the external forces which threaten that venerable and defenceless edifice on the other, we make bold to forecast the nation's destinies, there appears to be good ground for the belief that the factor which must continue to weigh most heavily in determining the immediate future lies in the fierceness of the struggle for bare existence. Admitting the continuance of conditions which create a population in excess of the normal food supply, there follows the necessity for an effective central authority ruling *à l'Orientale*. Without such an authority, the criminal classes, the dangerous elements that are ever in wait to prey on the industry of the peasantry and labouring classes, must increase and multiply with amazing rapidity—as they have done for the past six months—and gradually reduce the country, through chaotic destruction, to a condition of complete exhaustion.

Young China has been welcomed, as I have said, because the Manchus had become identified with calamity—but a Young

China that wears the strange garments of the Europeans, and yet fails to exercise any effective authority, will not long be acknowledged as the ruling power. Despite the growth of national consciousness that has taken place during the past twenty years, the deep-rooted instincts of the race remain unmistakably unpolitical and philosophically indifferent to the origin of constituted authority, so long as it ensures maintenance of the accepted order of things Celestial. The Chinese national consciousness, indeed, resembles in many respects that of the Jewish people in its pride of race, its intellectual and philosophic aristocracy, its powers of cohesion and passive resistance, its collective economic superiority. The record of the Wei-Hai-Wei regiment, the spectacle of Chinese viceroys, governors and *literati* eagerly seeking the foreigner's protection at Shanghai and other treaty ports; even the gratitude shown by the inhabitants of Peking for the presence of the foreign troops in their midst, all these are indications of the truth that, if it should come to a choice between Young China and chaos and foreign administration with law and order, the masses would choose the latter. In forecasting the probable outcome of the present phase of disorganisation, the question which immediately presents itself, therefore, is, What are the prospects of Young China's evolving an effective and acceptable administration under the Republic before the dangerous elements of the community shall have thrown off the last remnants of control? This is a question which each must answer for himself by the light of his knowledge or his faith. For myself, remembering the ancestry and genesis of Young China, being personally acquainted with many of its leading spirits, having followed its opinions and activities in every province from the beginning of the present revolution, I am compelled to the conviction that salvation from this quarter is impossible: not only because Young China itself is unregenerate and undisciplined, but because its ideals and projects of government involve the creation of a new social and political structure, utterly unsuited to the character and traditions of the race; because it is contrary to all experience that a people cut off from its deep-rooted beliefs and habits of life should develop and retain a vigorous national consciousness.

J. O. P. Bland.

THE HÔTEL DE RAMBOUILLET

1. **Voiture et les Origines de l'Hôtel de Rambouillet (1597–1635).** Par Émile Magne. Paris : Mercure de France, 1911.
2. **Voiture et les Années de Gloire de l'Hôtel de Rambouillet (1636–1684).** Par Émile Magne. Paris : Mercure de France. 1912.
3. **Un Poète protecteur des Lettres au XVIIe siècle, Jean Chapelain.** Par Georges Collas. Paris : Perrin et Cie. 1912.
4. **Œuvres de Voiture. Lettres et Poésies.** Nouvelle édition revue sur le manuscrit de Conrart. Par A. Ubicini. 2 vols. Paris. Charpentier. 1855.
5. **Les Historiettes.** Par Tallemant des Réaux. Édition de MM. Monmerqué et Paulin. 10 tom. Paris. 1854.

THE fashion of the moment, whether in literature or in art, whether in England or in France, favours what is rough, vivid and undisciplined. A new generation of readers welcomes the lyrical effusions of the cowboy, the lumberman, the tramp, and even the apache. It accepts Bubu de Montparnasse as a hero and does not shrink from overhearing the confidences of a burglar. There is no reason why we should exercise our sarcasm over these *naïvetés* of taste, while indeed, as social beings, we are even entitled to rejoice at them, since, in the language of practical aestheticism, a positive always involves a negative. If this age dotes on the dirtiness of tramps, it is because every one of us is obliged to be occupied and clean ; and if the apache is the object of our poetry, it is because, in our extremely settled, confident and comfortable lives, we miss the excitement of being in personal danger. But let the delicate social balance of our existence be again disturbed, let us become practically accustomed to starvation and outrage and murder, and not another strophe would our poets address to the drunken navvy or the grimy bathchairman. If London or Paris were to burn, if only for a fortnight, literature and art would hurry back to the study of princesses and to the language of the Golden Age.

No more striking instance of this oscillation is to be found in history than is afforded by France at the opening of the seventeenth century, in the creation of what is called the *vie de salon*. This movement, the most civilising, the most refining in the intellectual life of France, was the direct outcome of the

convulsion of the civil wars. It was the ugliness, the wickedness, the brutality of the reigns of the later Valois which made the best minds of Paris determine to be gentle, beautiful and delicate under Louis XIII. Forty years of savage rapine had laid a severe embargo upon civilisation, and no picture of France in 1625 can be complete without a glance at the background of 1575. In that half-century of administrative disorder, in the bitter and distracted state of country life, the population had lost confidence in virtue, and had become rude and dishonest. One of the Venetian ambassadors, travelling through France, declared of the Frenchmen whom he met, that ' the sight of blood had made them cunning, coarse and wild.' If such was the condition of the countryside, the towns were even worse. There resulted from the misery after the siege of Paris a universal weariness, a longing for tolerance in man to man, a yearning for refinement in private life, for security, for cultivation, for repose of mind and body and estate.

That Henri IV. was a Protestant has led, perhaps, to some injustice being done to his memory in a Catholic country. But he deserved well of France in this critical moment. Every necessity of life had become extravagantly dear, every branch of industry depressed, if not extinct, when he came to the throne. He set himself to be the guardian of trade, and of the arts. He rebuilt cities, and a contemporary reported of him that ' no sooner was he master of Paris, than the streets were ' swarming with masons.' The shrewdness of Henri IV. broke down the old superstition, of which Sully made himself the obstinate spokesman, that agriculture was the only source of wealth for France. The King persisted in encouraging the manufactures of silk and linen ; in widening the circle of commercial interests ; in teaching Frenchmen to achieve wealth and honour as architects, painters, sculptors and cabinet-makers. The prestige of the military nobles grew less and less, that of the *bourgeoisie* grew more and more, while between them a new class, refined, intelligent, a little timid and supple in their professional adroitness, that *nouvelle aristocratie de robe*, of which M. Lavisse has spoken, came to the front and gave its tone to the surface of life.

The general trend of the best thought, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, was towards the polishing of society, left

roughened and rusty by the long wars of religion. But the court of Henri IV. was too coarse, and too little in sympathy with the mental aspirations of the age, to carry out this design, which needed other influences than those which could emanate from Marie de Médicis. Meanwhile, the great importance of the provincial centres had rapidly declined, and it was Paris that gave the tone to France. This then was the moment when a peculiarly Parisian centre was needed, independent of the court, yet in political sympathy with it, a centre of imagination and intelligence not too austere in its morals, not too pedantic in its judgments, to include the characteristic minds of the age, whatever their limitation or peculiarity; and yet definitely, unflinchingly and for a sufficient length of time, radiating politeness and authority. Such a Parisian centre must be aristocratic, yet liberal and intelligent; it must lay down rules of conduct, and contrive to get them obeyed; it must be recognised and haunted by the first men and women of the century; it must be actuated in equal proportions by the genius of discipline, and by that of easy grace and accomplished gallantry. In short, it must be what Providence astonishingly provided for French society at that moment of its sorest need, the unparalleled Hôtel de Rambouillet, with, as its prophetess and châtelaine, one of the most charming women who has ever occupied the pen of the memoir-maker.

In observing the history of the famous Chambre Bleue, it cannot but strike an English critic how far more articulate French opinion was than English in the seventeenth century. Although, as we shall presently see, documents have been slow in forthcoming, they existed, and still exist, in profusion. But while we can now study, almost from day to day, the intrigues, the amusements and the enthusiasms of the group in the Rue Saint-Thomas, the record of a similar *salon* open in England at the same epoch is still shrouded in a darkness which is likely never to be penetrated. So far as we can venture to judge there must have been many points of likeness between the Marquise de Rambouillet and Lucy Countess of Bedford. The circle of the friends of each was illustrious. Donne was a greater poet-divine than Cospeau or Godeau; our national vanity may fairly set Daniel and Drayton against Voiture and Chapelain, while even Corneille is not shamed by being balanced by Ben Jonson. The coterie of the Countess of Bedford may probably

have been less wealthy, less sparkling, more provincial than that of Madame de Rambouillet, but the melancholy thing is that we lack the opportunity of comparing them. Save for vague allusions in the poets, and for a dim tradition of politeness, we form no detailed impression of the feasts of wit at Twickenham, whereas about those in the Rue Saint-Thomas we know almost as much as heart can wish. In the communication of social impressions England stood much further behind France in the seventeenth century than the individual genius of her writers accounts for. We have, however, one possible recompense : the field of irresponsible conjecture is infinitely wider in our island chronicle. In France, even the craziest of faddists could not hope for a hearing if he suggested that the tragedies of Pierre Corneille were secretly written by Richelieu in his lighter moments.

On the history of the Hôtel de Rambouillet the documents which survive are very numerous, and probably have not yet been exhaustively examined. The seventeenth century in France was awake to the importance of its own immortality, and set down the records of its social and literary glory with complacency. The memorials of the Hôtel de Rambouillet to be found scattered over the works of such contemporaries as Segrais, Pellisson and Conrart have long been known. The poems and correspondence of Voiture, of course, form a mine of treasure, which was first competently worked by Ubicini in the edition of Voiture's works which is mentioned at the head of this article. It is now sifted to its last crumb of gold by M. Émile Magne in the eloquent and learned volumes which he has just published. There is also, and most important of all, Tallemant des Réaux, of whom we shall presently speak at greater length. M. Magne and M. Collas, with Voiture and Chapelain respectively in their particular thoughts, have turned over the priceless wealth of MSS. in the *Archives nationales*. It is probable that we now possess, thanks to the researches of these scholars, as full an account of the Hôtel de Rambouillet as we are likely to obtain. It may be pointed out that these exact records, founded upon positive documents, show the danger of such hypotheses as not a few previous historians have rashly taken up. In the light of present knowledge, it is necessary to use not merely Roederer (1835), but even the more accurate Livet (1870), with caution.

The Hôtel existed, as a centre of light and civility, for nearly seventy years, and involved the whole careers of two generations. Its history, which was developed by circumstances, and somewhat modified in its course by changes of taste, found no chronicler until it had existed some twenty years. That preliminary period, from the death of Henri IV. to the arrival of Tallemant and Voiture, is precisely the time about which we should like to know most, and about which we are doomed to know least. The violent close of the reign, in a last wild crime, had, as we see from every species of evidence, brought with it a longing for serenity and repose. The keynote of the best society became a cultivation of simplicity, refinement and delicacy. This growth of a new spirit was identified with the Marquis and Marquise of Rambouillet, but exactly how at first we are at a loss to tell, and even M. Magne is silent. A careful setting side by side of scattered impressions may enable us, however, while avoiding those hypotheses of which we have given warning, to form some idea of the foundation of the Hôtel and its prestige.

Charles d'Angennes, Marquis of Rambouillet and Pisani, who has given its title to the celebrated union of hearts, must not long detain us, for the excellent reason that not much is recorded about him. He was probably born about 1577, and he died in Paris in 1652, having become blind about twelve years earlier. His eyesight was very peculiar ; perhaps he was colour-blind. On this subject he was sensitive, and tried to conceal his condition. On one occasion, when the Duc de Montausier, who was known to have recently ordered a gorgeous scarlet costume, appeared at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, his host called out ' Ah ! Monsieur, la belle escarlate ! '—which was unlucky, because the Duc had happened to call in a black suit. Tallemant says that the Marquis ' avait terriblement d'esprit, ' mais un peu frondeur.' In this he doubtless resembled most of the wits of that age, who liked to let their antagonists feel that there were claws under the fur. In wit his wife, with her sweet consideration and delicate humorous tact, was immeasurably his superior ; it was she, and not he, who gave the Hôtel its famous amenity. We must not measure this in all things by our standards. About 1625 there was quite an inundation of spiteful, and sometimes obscene, verse in France, and this has to be taken into consideration in dealing with the *salons*.

The Hôtel de Rambouillet kept this in some check, but was amply aware of the entertainment to be got by clothing satire—what Agrippa d'Aubigné called *la malplaisante vérité* —in smooth and well-turned verse. The Marquis was himself a versifier, and he shared to the full his wife's respect for letters.

There is nothing, however, to show that this agreeable man would have been able, by his unaided talents, to make a mark upon the age he lived in. He was the satellite of an infinitely more refulgent luminary, his extraordinary wife. If there is such a thing as social genius, on the same lines as literary or artistic genius, this was undoubtedly possessed, in a very high degree, by Catherine de Vivonne, Marquise de Rambouillet. She was born at Rome in 1588 ; half an Italian, her mother was a Roman princess, Julia Savella ; and when, long afterwards, the Marquise had become not merely French, but almost the culture of France incarnate, she loved to dwell on her Italian parentage. Tallemant tells us that she always thought the Savelli the best family in the world ; it was her faith. At the age of six, she became a naturalised French citizen, and in January 1600, being in her twelfth year, she was married to Charles d'Angennes, who, his father being still alive, was then Vidame du Mans. Her own sober and stately father, the Marquis de Pisani, was just dead. He had left Catherine a conspicuous heiress. In later years, she spoke with characteristic humour of the way in which she was intimidated, poor child of twelve, by her husband's years, since he was twenty-three, and she said that she had never become quite used to feeling grown-up in his presence. But this was her whimsical way of talking, for there really existed between them the closest and most intimate affection. The Marquis and the Marquise were always in love with one another, throughout their extended married life of more than half a century ; and in that age of light loves and cynical relationships, even baseless ill-nature never found any serious charge of frivolity to bring against this gracious lady.

It is true that it could not be difficult to show complaisance to Catherine de Rambouillet. She was never dull, never inattentive, never indiscreet. We hear that she had an extraordinary native gift for being present when she was wanted, and occupied elsewhere when her company would have been inconvenient.

As years grew upon her, it seems as though this instinct for pleasing became a little too emphatic. Almost the only fault which any chronicler brings against her is that, towards the end, she was not critical enough, that she liked too many people, that her individuality melted into a general indulgence. But she was surrounded by petulant poets and snarling courtiers, and that this mild censure of her should be insinuated is, probably, but another tribute to her tact. She was like Milton's Lady ; not indeed ' chained up in alabaster,' but serene, open-eyed and gay in the midst of a monstrous rout of ambitions and vanities which often resembled ' stabled wolves or tigers at their prey.' One of her most striking characteristics obviously was her power of ruling a society from its centre without making her rule oppressive. All the anecdotes of her discipline in her *salon* show the coolness of her judgment and the velvet strength of her hand. She was capable of strong dislike, yet with an Italian faculty for concealing it. She hated Louis XIII. to the inmost fibre of her being, for what seemed to her his despicable qualities, yet he never discovered it.

Those who regard Catherine de Rambouillet as one of the most engaging figures of Europe in the seventeenth century, must regret that, from an age where portrait-painting was so largely cultivated, no picture of her has come down to us. All we know is that she was beautiful and tall ; the poets compared her to a pine-tree. It was supposed that she never consented to sit to a painter, but M. Magne has discovered that there were portraits. Scudéry, he believes, possessed engravings from paintings by Van Mol and by du Cayer. The earlier of these, painted in 1645, represented her gazing at the dead body of her father. These works of art appear to be hopelessly lost. We are thrown back on the written ' portraits,' in the alembicated style of the middle of the century, which adorn a host of novels and poems. Of these the fullest is that introduced by Madeleine de Scudéry into the seventh volume of her huge romance, ' Le Grand Cyrus.' M. Émile Magne, confronted with the ' precious ' terms of this description, and the vagueness of it, loses his temper with poor Mlle. de Scudéry, whom he calls *cette pécore*. It is true that the physical details which would interest us are omitted, but it is hardly true to say, that ' il est impossible ' de rien démêler au griffonage [de Mlle. de Scudéry], sinon que ' Mme. de Rambouillet était belle.' This is not quite just, and

to avenge the great Madeleine for being called a *pécore*, we will quote, what M. Magne surprisingly omits, part of the character of Cléomire, the pseudonym of Mme. de Rambouillet in 'Cyrus':

> She is tall and graceful. The delicacy of her complexion is beyond expression. The eyes of Cléomire are so admirably beautiful that no painter has ever been able to do justice to them. All her passions are in subjection to her good sense.

This might be more precise, but the touch about the eyes is helpful. Chapelain celebrated (in 1666, just after her death)

> Cet air, cette douceur, cette grâce, ce port,
> Ce chef d'œuvre admiré du Midi jusqu'au Nord;

And Tallemant, always the best reporter, speaks of the permanent beauty of her complexion, which she would never consent to touch artificially. The only concession to fashion which she made in old age was to rouge her lips, which had turned blue. Tallemant wished she would not do even this. When she was very old, her head shook with a sort of palsy; this was attributed to her having indulged too much in the eating of pounded ambergris, but perhaps a more obvious reason could be found for so natural an infirmity.

In an age so troubled and so turbulent as that of Henri IV., public attention was concentrated in wonderment on the serene beatitude of the Rambouillets. 'So rest, for ever rest, O 'princely pair!' the admiring court might be conceived as saying to a couple so dignified, so calm and so unaffected in their attachment. 'Tout le monde admire la magnifique entente, à 'travers leur vie limpide, du Marquis et de la Marquise.' Their limpid life—that was the just description of a mode of conduct so rare in that age, and at that social elevation, as to be relatively unique. What existences the reverse of limpid, lives tortured and turbid and mud-stained, do memoir-writers of that time, the Segrais and the Tallemants, reveal on all sides of them! Both were gifted, and each was persuaded of the excellence of learning and literature, although in talents the wife considerably surpassed the husband. Madame de Rambouillet was versed in several literatures. She spoke Italian and Spanish, the two fashionable languages of the time, to perfection. She loved all beautiful objects, and not one of the fine arts failed to find eager appreciation from her. In order to enjoy the sources of poetic distinction, she taught herself Latin,

that she might read Virgil in the original. But she soon relaxed these studies, which might easily have landed her in pedantry. She became the mother of seven children, to whose bringing-up she gave strict attention. She found that her health, although her constitution was good, needed care. Perhaps she gave way, a little, to an amiable Italian indolence; at all events, the strenuousness which her early years had threatened subsided into a watchful, hospitable, humorous and memorable hospitality. If there could be rank maintained in such matters, Madame de Rambouillet would probably take place as the most admirable hostess in history.

But, to entertain, a house was needed. The old Marquis de Pisani had bought, in 1599, a ramshackle dwelling, close to the Louvre, in the Rue Saint-Thomas, which became, at his death, the property of his daughter. In 1604 when, it is to be noted, she was only sixteen years of age, she pulled it down and built the famous Hôtel on the site.

Young as she was, it is certain that the Marquise was herself the architect of the Hôtel de Rambouillet. A professional architect had been called in to rebuild the house, but when he submitted his designs to her they dissatisfied her by their conventionality. Tallemant describes them—a saloon on one side, a bedroom on the other, a staircase in the middle, nothing could be more poor. Moreover, the courtyard was pinched in extent and irregular in shape. One evening, after she had been dreaming over the drawings, the young Marquise called out 'Quick! some paper! I have thought of what I want!' She had been trained to use a pencil, and she immediately drew out an elevation, which the builders followed point by point. Her design was so bold, so original, and so handsome, that the house made a sensation in Paris. The Queen-Mother, when she built the Luxembourg, sent her architects to study the Hôtel de Rambouillet before they started their plans.

In all this matter of the foundation of the Hôtel and the opening of the famous *salon*, M. Magne has made considerable discoveries, which should be distinguished from much in his charming books in which he has had no choice but to follow earlier published authorities. He has made excellent use of the 'Inventaires' of 1652, 1666 and 1671, to which attention had, however, already been drawn by M. Charles Sauze. But a ground plan of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, from a contemporary

map of Paris by Gomboust, is less known, and a reproduction of this is a singular aid to the reader of M. Magne's 'Voiture.' We see that it stood actually next door to the famous Hôtel de Chevreuse, in comparison with which, in its sparkling newness, in its slated turrets and its charming combinations of pale stone and salmon-coloured brick, it seemed an expression of the new age in a triumphant defiance of the old. From both houses could be seen, just across the quiet Rue Saint-Thomas, and over a strip of waste ground, the massive contour of the Louvre; a great garden, on the west side, stretched away behind the house, down to the corner of the Rue de Richelieu. M. Magne has discovered that M. and Mme. de Rambouillet took up their abode in their new house early in 1607; this fixes what has hitherto been quite vague, the commencement of the Hôtel de Rambouillet. But the Marquise was still only nineteen years of age, and it would be a mistake to suppose that, precocious as people were in those days, she began at once to exercise her celebrated hospitality, or to fill the rooms with tapestry, statues and men of wit. This came on gradually and naturally, without any violence of forethought. It has been suggested that the Marquise founded her *salon*, or, less pompously, began to gather congenial friends about her, in 1613. It is difficult to say on what documents this exact date is based. Her known aversion to Louis XIII., and her growing preference for receiving her friends at home over appearing in a crowd at court—both of them, doubtless, symptoms of her personal delicacy, which shrank from the suspicion of roughness—were probably emphasised after the murder of Concini in 1617, when the great nobles, who had defied the weak regency of Marie de Médicis, boldly swept back into Paris. Doubtless this was the time when Madame de Rambouillet began to practise a more cloistered virtue among the splendour and fragility of her treasures, and first intimated to noble and elegant friends, who were scandalised by the rowdiness of the Louvre, that here was an asylum where they might discuss poetry for hours on the velvet of her incrusted couches, or walk, in solemn ranks, among the parterres of her exquisite walled garden.

The character of pedantry and preciosity which the Hôtel afterwards incurred, is not to be traced in any of its original features. In its early years there was no atmosphere of 'intellectual beatitude' about it. But that a certain intellec-

tual standard was set up from the very first it is impossible to question. From the compliments of the earliest inmates of the Hôtel to the eulogistic epitaphs which were scattered on the hearse of the Marquise, all her devotees agree in celebrating her passionate love of literature. Clumsy phrases, rude expressions, the coarseness of a language still in process of purification, were a positive distress to her ; and Tallemant has a droll anecdote about the agitation into which she was thrown by the use of so vulgar a word as ' scurvy,' *teigneux*, in an epigram which was being read to her. With these tendencies, she was peculiarly fitted to welcome to her intimacy the man who of all others was at that time most occupied with the task of correcting and clarifying the French language. An inevitable attraction must have drawn Malherbe to the doors of the Hôtel de Rambouillet.

It would be of interest, and even of some importance, if we could discover the date at which Malherbe began to frequent the Hôtel de Rambouillet, since there can be little doubt, that it was to him that it owed its intellectual direction. Unfortunately, this is not easy to do. The poet Racan, whose invaluable notes and anecdotes were adopted by Tallemant to form the body of the *historiette* on Malherbe, did not anticipate how grateful posterity would be for a few dates sprinkled here and there over his narrative. But the fact that Tallemant here took the line, so very unusual with him, of adopting somebody else's life of one of his heroes, can only be accounted for by the double supposition that Malherbe could not be omitted from his gallery, and yet had quitted the scene too early for Tallemant to know much about him at first hand. He must indeed have arrived at the Hôtel very soon after its formation, since he was sixty-two years of age when we suppose it to have begun, and in 1628 he died. The Duc de Broglie was probably right when he conjectured that Malherbe was practically the first, and as long as he lived the foremost, of the literary clan which met in the Chambre Bleue. Racan, who accompanied and may have introduced the elder poet to the Hôtel de Rambouillet, says that it was ' sur les vieux jours de Malherbe ' that the latter had the curious conversation about the proper heroic name, or poetic pseudonym, which ought to fix all future references to the Marquise, a conversation which led to his writing an eclogue in which he calls himself Mélibée and his disciple Arcan. We quote Tallemant, who is quoting Racan :

'The very day that he sketched out this eclogue, fearing that the name Arthénice [Catherine] if it was used of two persons [for Racan had addressed Catherine Chabot as Arthénice, in a pastoral] would make a confusion between those two persons, Malherbe passed the whole afternoon with Racan turning the name about. All they could make of it was Arthénice, Eracinte and Carintée. The first of those they considered the prettiest, but as Racan was using this also in a pastoral, Malherbe concluded by choosing Rodante.'

Unfortunately Madame de Rambouillet, who had plenty of humour, declined the name of Rodante, which would better have adorned a mouse than a great lady, and Malherbe threw his consideration for Racan to the winds. Madame de Rambouillet became for him and remained

Celle pour qui je fis le beau nom d'Arthénice,

and he called her

Cette jeune bergère à qui les destinées
Sembloient avoir donné mes dernières années.

We gather that the sound judgment and the exquisite charm of Madame de Rambouillet attracted Malherbe away from the other *salons* which he affected, particularly from those of the Vicomtesse d'Aulchy and of Madame des Loges. It was the latter lady whose ears the grim poet soundly boxed in her own house on a celebrated occasion. He was a formidable guest as well as a tyrant in literature.

But the relations of Malherbe with Madame de Rambouillet during the last ten years of his life were kept on a level of unruffled dignity on the one side and on the other. It is evident that the Marquise was predisposed to accept *la Doctrine* which Malherbe, with so splendid a force and pride, was about to impose upon his countrymen. No man of letters has lived, in any country, who was more possessed than he of the necessity of watching over the purity of language, of cultivating in prose and verse a simple, lucid, and logical style, of removing from the surface of literature, by an arrogant discipline, all traces of obscurity, pomposity and looseness. He held the honour of the French language above all other obligations, and the stories of his sacrificing questions of personal interest, and even affection, to his passion for correct diction, for a noble manner of writing and speaking, are eloquent of the austere and dry genius of this masterful rather than charming poet, who, nevertheless, had so profound and so lasting an influence on French letters. Such a man as this, fanatically possessed by an abstract ambition,

needs the sympathy of a wise and beneficent woman, and the old Malherbe, in the twilight of his days, found such an Egeria in Catherine de Rambouillet. It was in the Hôtel that the famous discussions on the value, selection, and meaning of words, on nobility in eloquence, on purity and force in versification, first took place, and the heat from them radiated through France. The new era of style found its cradle in the Chambre Bleue.

But what was this Blue Room, this mysterious and azure grot in which the genius of French classic poetry went through its transformation? There was not much mystery about it. It was a room, deep in the magnificence of the Hôtel, where the Marquise was in the habit of receiving the familiar visits of her best friends. The novelty of it was its colour; all other *salons* in Paris being at that time painted red or drab. Out of the Blue Room there opened a more secret retreat, her *cabinet* or *alcove*, where she could withdraw from all companionship, and spend her time in reading or meditating. The furniture of the whole Hôtel de Rambouillet was on a scale of opulent splendour, but the rarity of the objects brought together was concentrated in the *cabinet*, which was, as M. Magne puts it, a sort of altar which the Marquise raised to herself. Every object in it was fragile, brilliant, and precious. In the days when Malherbe frequented the Hôtel, it is probable that no inner room existed. Tallemant gives us the very odd history of what led to its formation. The Marquise in her youth was active and ready to expose herself to the weather, but about 1623 she began to be threatened by an *incommodité*, which made her unable to bear exposure to heat. She had been in the habit of taking long walks in Paris, but one summer's day, when the sun suddenly came out while she was strolling at La Cour-la-Reine, on the Champs Elysées, she nearly fainted, and was threatened with erysipelas. The following winter, the first time that she drew up her chair to read by the fire, the same phenomenon came on. She was now divided between perishing with cold or suffering miseries of heat, and she therefore invented, taking the idea from the Spanish 'alcove,' a little supplementary room, where she could sit close to her friends, while they gathered round the hearth, and yet not be smitten by the flames. In 1656, in the great winter, we hear of her, now an elderly woman, lying on her bed, heaped over with furs, but not daring to have a fire in sight.

Her energy did not leave her because of this disability. The

letter-writers of the period describe her extraordinary activity. She had a great love of pretty and elaborate practical jokes which were in the taste of the time. Hers, however, were distinguished by the fact that they were never indecent and never ill-natured. But when an idea occurred to Madame de Rambouillet, she rested not until the wild scheme was accomplished. Voiture and Tallemant are full of instances of her fertility. One instance out of many was the passion which she expended in making a cascade in the park at Rambouillet, to startle a party of guests. The water had to be brought up from the little tarn of Montorgueil, and the Marquise superintended every spade and every pipe. Carried on by her enthusiastic presence, a team of workmen laboured night and day to complete the prodigious plaything, conducting their ingenious hydraulics by the flare of torches. We could fill pages with the proofs of her gaiety, her ingenuity, the amazing freshness and vivacity of her mind, but the reader can turn to the original sources for them. It may be suggested that, while the various independent authorities really confirm the legend in its outline, when they tell the same story, it will generally be found that Tallemant tells it more naturally and more exactly than Segrais or Voiture. It is also to be remembered that it was Tallemant who observed longest and most closely, and brought least suspicion of vanity to bear on his relation. There is a phrase buried somewhere in the vast tissue of the 'Historiettes' which deserves to be better known. Speaking incidentally of the Marquise de Rambouillet, Tallemant betrays that she was really the source of all his inspiration : 'c'est d'elle que je tiens la plus 'grande et la meilleure partie de ce que j'ai escrit et que j'escriray 'dans ce livre.' This gives his statements their peculiar authority with regard to that Blue Room, which he elsewhere calls 'le rendez-vous de ce qu'il y avait de plus galant à la Cour, 'et de plus joly parmy les beaux-esprits du siècle.' He quite frequently introduces an anecdote with the words 'J'ay ouy 'dire à Mme. de Rambouillet.'

It would therefore be ungrateful to speak of the Hôtel de Rambouillet without paying a tribute to the strange quality of Tallemant des Réaux. French criticism, in applauding his industry, has hardly done justice to the talent, almost the genius, of this extraordinary man. With an unrivalled gift of observation, he combined that clear objective sense of the value of little things, which is so valuable in a memoir-writer, and he is

the very prince of those biographers to whom nothing regarding the subjects of their art seems common or unclean. He has the keen eye for detail of his English contemporary, John Aubrey, and his 'Historiettes' are really, in the sense of Aubrey, 'Minutes of Lives.' But Tallemant has much more design in his work, and a broader sense of the relation of moral and intellectual values. Saint-Simon, who was a child when Tallemant died, has more passion, a more impetuous and broader sweep of style, and a more intelligent appreciation of the scene of life. It was not for Tallemant des Réaux to paint 'des grands fresques 'historiques.' He is as trivial and as picturesque as Boswell, as crude as Pepys, and, like them both, he is completely indifferent to what other people may find scandalous. He moved in the best society, and he was of it; but in his life-time no one seems to have paid him much attention. Voiture was often in the centre of the stage at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, and what answered in those days to limelight followed him whenever he made one of his brilliant appearances; Tallemant was a shadowy super, hanging about in the wings, but he was always there.

He had the best right in the world to be there. Gédéon Tallemant was a close kinsman of the Marquise, whose sister, Marie de Rambouillet, had married the biographer's father, a Huguenot banker of Bordeaux, head of one of the best provincial families of the day. Gédéon was born at La Rochelle in 1607, and was therefore nearly twenty years younger than his cousin's wife, the famous châtelaine of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, whom he adored. When he came to Paris, about 1637, her coterie was already at its height, but he was immediately admitted to it, and no doubt began no less immediately to ask questions and to take notes. He had every possible opportunity; his brother and a cousin were members of the new French Academy: his father was a Mæcenas to Corneille and others: he himself married (in January 1646) his cousin Élizabeth de Rambouillet, a union which made him the familiar of La Fontaine and La Sablière. In 1650 he bought the château and estate of Plessis-Rideau, in Touraine, and by letters-patent changed the name to Les Réaux, which he then adopted as a surname. Here he entertained his lifelong friends—the associates of the Hôtel, and other men of high professional rank, Patru, Ablancourt, the Père Rapin. He knew absolutely everybody; he was adorably indiscreet; and those who associated

with him perceived in him only a wonderful talker (Maucroix says that he ' racontait aussy bien qu'homme de France '), and a lover of poetry who started writing an ' Œdipe ' before Corneille. What few of them knew was that this obliging friend and graceful companion was putting down in an immense MS. all the anecdotes, all the intrigues, all the tricks of manner, all the traits of character, of the multitude of his polite acquaintances. He has left more than 500 of his little highly-finished portraits of people he knew, and he knew everyone in that age and place worth knowing.

It is doubtful at what particular time he wrote the ' Historiettes.' He was composing, or perhaps revising, part of them in 1657, but some must be later, and many may be earlier in date than that; it is probable that he ceased writing in 1665. He has been accused of being a spiteful chronicler of the vices of the great, and he has been charged with a love of looseness. But his own description is more just : ' Je prétends dire le bien ' et le mal, sans dissimuler la vérité.' He writes with an air of humorous malice, pleased to draw the cloak off the limbs of hypocrisy, but not moved by any strong moral indignation. Like Pepys, he enjoyed giving a disinterested picture of the details of ordinary private life, but was rather more cynically amused by them than scandalised. He wrote, or at least intended to write, ' Mémoires de la régence d'Anne d'Autriche,' but this has totally disappeared, and we need not regret it. Gédéon Tallemant is amply immortalised by the ' Historiettes,' which fill ten closely printed volumes in the excellent edition of MM. Monmerqué and Paulin of Paris. They are like the work of some brilliant Dutch painter of sordid interiors. He is not always well inspired. He says nothing more adequate about Pascal than that he was ' ce garçon qui inventa une machine ' admirable pour l'arithmétique,' but Pascal was hardly of his world. In 1685 Tallemant became a Catholic, converted by the Père Rapin, and, having outlived all his friends, he died, probably in November 1692, leaving a huge MS., the principal subject of which is an analysis of the society that met within the Hôtel de Rambouillet.

At his death that MS. vanished, ' as rare things will.' It turned up again in a library at Montigny-Lencoup in 1803. We may note, as a curious coincidence, that while the publication Evelyn's ' Diary ' dates from 1818, and while the deciphering of Pepys began in 1819, it was in 1820, that Châteaugiron set

to work at copying out the 'Historiettes,' which were not published until 1835. Three of the most important MS. memoirs of the seventeenth century, were thus independently examined for the first time at practically the same moment of the nineteenth. Each publication was an event in literary history.

No such concealment, no such late discovery, has marked the course of Voiture, whose letters and poems were published by his nephew Pinchesne in 1650, only two years after the poet's death. In this remarkable miscellany, which has been incessantly reprinted, and which forms one of the recognised lesser classics of France, we find ourselves breathing the very atmosphere of the Hôtel de Rambouillet. It is, indeed, amusing to reflect that, for fifteen years before her death, the Marquise and all her circle possessed, and shared with a wide public, this elaborate body of evidence as to their friendships, their tastes, and their amusements. In the 'Œuvres' of Voiture, reprinted at least seventeen times during the lifetime of the Marquise, the world at large was admitted to the conversations of the Blue Room, and it eagerly responded to the invitation. There was something about the supple genius of Voiture, at once daring and discreet, apparently tearing every veil off an intimacy, and yet in fact wrapping it in an impenetrable gauze of mystery, which made him the ideal revealer to excite and baffle curiosity, so that though he tells so much, as he stands at the top of the stairs of the Hôtel and takes the town into his confidence, yet he leaves plenty of things untold, to be whispered into the ears of posterity by Tallemant and Conrart.

The father of Voiture was a shopkeeper who sold wine at the sign of the Chapeau de Roses at Amiens, and there his son Vincent was born in 1595. The author of 'Alcidalis et Zélide,' was therefore the contemporary of Herrick and of George Herbert. If the last-mentioned had not rejected 'the painted 'pleasures of a Court-life' for the retirements of a saint, he might have been the English Voiture, with his charming gifts and ingenious graces. The year 1626, which saw Herbert adopt the solemn vocation of a priest, is probably that in which Voiture, introduced by Chardebonne, took up his station for the rest of his life, as principal literary oracle and master of the gaieties in the Hôtel de Rambouillet. His father was honestly supplying wine to the Queen-Mother, Marie de Médicis, and there was no question in his son's case, as in that of some others,

of doubtful or partial nobility. Vincent Voiture was frankly and openly a *bourgeois*, admitted into that strictly guarded aristocracy because of his abundant talents, his wit, his pleasantness, his delicious social qualities, and also because it was part of the scheme of the Marquise de Rambouillet to break down the boredom of the exclusive privilege of rank for its own sake.

The main principle of the Hôtel was a study of the art of how to behave. The rules of *la bienséance* were strictly laid down there, after close discussion among persons of light and leading. There was a strong resistance made to the roughness of the country noble, to the awkwardness of the ordinary citizen, to the inky fingers of the pedant, to the slovenly petticoat, the disordered wig, the bespattered boot. The attention of both sexes was persistently called to these matters of behaviour and *tenue*, which had an importance at that date which we may easily, in our twentieth-century intolerance, ridicule and ignore. We see the comic side of this extreme solicitude about dress and ceremony, etiquette and behaviour, in such a book as Furetière's amusing 'Roman Bourgeois' (1666), but we may see the seriousness, the stately value of it, in the tragedies of Corneille and the maxims of La Rochefoucauld. The school of *la politesse* became that in which every talent must graduate, however grave its after-labours were to be. Even the solemn Baillet, writing the life of no less dignified a person than Descartes, mentions that the philosopher passed, like all other well-bred lads, 'aux promenades, au jeu et aux autres divertissemens qui font l'occupation des personnes de qualité et des honnêtes gens du siècle.' In this school, the elegant and supple Voiture, impregnated with the literature of 'Amadis de Gaule,' and with the language of Spanish chivalry, intimidated by no hyperbole of compliment, capable alike of plunging into the deep waters and of swimming safe to shore, always on the verge of absurdity, always gliding down the agreeable side of it, persistent, subtle, entertaining, extravagant—in this school Voiture was the triumphant, the unmastered master. His best letters, his best sonnets, show him to have been able, at his most vibrating moments, to rise out of this element of billets-doux to better things. He is of all composers of society verse and prose the lightest and the swiftest, and we may say to those who sneer at so unique a talent what Madame de Sévigné said of them in her day: 'Tant pis pour ceux qui ne l'entendent pas!'

If one literary figure is more closely identified with the Hôtel

de Rambouillet than Voiture, it must be Chapelain. It is therefore curious that while M. Magne was preparing his picturesque volumes on the former, M. Collas should be independently writing the earliest biography of the latter. These coincidences are odd, but we are accustomed to them; they show that a subject is 'in the air.' When Chapelain made his first appearance at the Hôtel, perhaps in 1635, Voiture had long been installed there. They fell out at first sight, like dog and cat. When the author of the 'Préface de l'Adone' stumbled over the precious floor, dressed like a scarecrow, in hunting boots and dirty linen, and made his clownish obeisance to the Marquise, she shrank a little from him, and Voiture broke into a scream of elfish laughter. Madame de Rambouillet never learned to care for Chapelain, and when he made clumsy love to Mlle. Paulet, 'the lioness,' the Blue Room shook with mirth. But when Mlle. Julie became a great personage, and especially as soon as the Duc de Montausier introduced the pure cultivation of pedantry into the Hôtel, the strong character of Chapelain asserted itself, while the death of Voiture left him unquestioned in authority. Grotesque as Chapelain was, he had a wonderful talent for adapting himself to circumstances, and his conversation, though massive and solemn, had charm, which even his enemies admitted to be extraordinary. Chapelain was never on those terms of petted intimacy with his host and hostess which the insinuating Voiture enjoyed, but he conquered a position of more genuine respect and esteem.

But to follow M. Collas and M. Magne into the later years of the Hôtel, when Mlle. de Rambouillet gave to the Blue Room a peculiar air of her own, would be impossible for us, with the limited space at our command. We must not go further than 1641, the year in which was produced the celebrated 'Guirlande de Julie.' After this point, not merely does the character of the scene change, and its tone become less pleasing, or at least less sympathetic, but for the reviewer the abundance of trees makes the wood itself almost invisible. Here we may point to an example of the superabundance of French material, which may almost console us for the comparative dimness and bareness of the contemporary English landscape. In dealing with this crowded age, M. Magne and M. Collas have shown a learned adroitness and the happy logic to which scholars of their race are trained. Of the two, M. Magne is the more vivacious, as befits the biographer of Voiture. M. Collas has more difficulty

in reconciling us with the tedious and pedantic Chapelain, who, nevertheless, as the founder of modern criticism and the mainstay of the infant Académie Française, deserved to find a biographer at last. The worst of it is that while Voiture, dancing-master to the Muses if you will, and *petit-maître* in excelsis, is at least a brisk and highly diverting personality, poor Chapelain, the typical academician, the mediocre poet, the spider at the heart of the wide intellectual web of his time, is not man enough to awaken our vivid sympathies. Moreover, to conclude on a note of bathos, M. Collas has neglected to append an index to his vast compendium of facts.

We must therefore refrain from entering the labyrinths of the later *préciosité*, amusing as they are, and must continue to concentrate our attention on the clearness, the sweetness, the purity with which the founder of the Hôtel, the great Madame de Rambouillet, throughout her long life, created an atmosphere of sympathy and unity around her. As long as she was paramount there, and until the influence of her daughter and her daughter's husband, together with her own languor, pushed her a little into the second line, gaiety was in the ascendant at the famous Hôtel. It is needful to assure ourselves of this, because in the later days it became purely intellectual, and dry in its priggishness. M. Magne, it is true, attributes this change not so much to the pedantic Latinism of the Duc de Montausier, and the hair-splitting of the academicians, as to the decay produced by gaiety itself. In an ingenious passage he says :

> ' The taste for badinage perverted in Voiture the taste for beauty. His genius glittered, quivered, frisked and palpitated, and the smile he wore was ever melting into irony. To depth he deliberately preferred an elegant futility. He was impregnated with the quality to which the age had given, in a noble sense, the name of gallantry. But, in reacting everywhere against vulgar roughness, the very excess of his effort landed him at last in preciosity.'

It never had that deplorable effect upon Madame de Rambouillet herself, on whose charming figure, swaying like a young pine-tree of the forest, we must fix our attention, if we would see only what was best in that remarkable and so vividly French revival of civilisation which took place under Louis XIII. Her purity of conduct was combined with no uncouth prudery. She refrained from judging others hardly, but she preserved, without a lapse, her own high standard of behaviour.

She had a lively horror of scandal, and desired that those about her, if they could not contrive to be virtuous, should at least be discreet. It was detestable to her to hear the gallants of the court boasting of their conquests. She said, in her amusing way, that if she herself could ever have been persuaded to leave the path of propriety, she must have chosen for a paramour some unctuous and secret prelate, but that she had never discovered one whom she could trust. It was her temperament, both of heart and brain, which led her to welcome the new spirit in Malherbe, whose simple, firm and lucid verses responded, after a revel of romanticism, to her classic craving for harmony and dignity. In Racan's pastoral poems, she welcomed a recovered love of country pleasures, and the graceful convention of a shepherd. She liked private letters, hitherto so pompous, to be composed in such terms that one seemed to hear the writer's voice chatting at the chimney-corner. Richelieu, although M. Magne denies the legend of his 'Discours sur 'l'Amour,' used to come to the Blue Room to have a good laugh with its delightful occupant, and everyone unbent in her sweet and easy presence. Tallemant has a story of no less dignified a personage than the Cardinal de La Valette romping with the Rambouillet children, and discovered by the Marquise hiding from them under a bed.

The close of the life of this marvellous woman was a sad one. She outlived all her early friends, even outlived the prestige of her own Blue Room. Six days after her death, Robinet composed a sort of funeral ode to her memory, closing with an epitaph, which, as neither M. Magne nor M. Collas happens to quote it, and it is little known, may be given here. It was written in January 1666 :

Ci gist la divine Arthénice,
Qui fut l'illustre protectrice
Des Arts que les neuf Sœurs inspirent aux humains.
Rome luy donna la naissance ;
Elle vint retablir en France
La gloire des anciens Romains.
Sa maison, des vertus le temple,
Sert aux particuliers d'un merveilleux exemple,
Et pourrait bien instruire encor les souverains.

This is not very good poetry, but it would be difficult to sum up more neatly the services of Madame de Rambouillet to France and to civilisation.

EDMUND GOSSE.

FOX

George the Third and Charles Fox. The Concluding Part of the American Revolution. By the Right Hon. SIR GEORGE OTTO TREVELYAN, Bart., O.M. vol. I. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1912.

IT is more than thirty years since a young statesman of brilliant promise, who was already celebrated as the author of one of the greatest of biographies, gave to the world a portly volume called 'The Early History of Charles James Fox.' Even the high literary renown of Mr. Trevelyan gained fresh lustre from that publication. A rare gift of historical portraiture, an uncommon familiarity with the social life of the period, the charm of style and the shrewd common sense that marked every page, raised the book above the level of all other monographs of its time, and no one has questioned its right to be included in every representative library. Yet, some of its warmest admirers are conscious of its grave faults. The title of the book is a misnomer; its construction chaotic. So few of its pages are devoted to its putative hero, and so many to certain of his contemporaries, that it might with justice have been christened 'The Strange Career of Mr. John Wilkes,' or 'The 'Early History of King George the Third.' Nor are its only blunders those of form. From first to last its author is swayed by the gospel according to Lord Macaulay. Unhappily, the attempt to trace an ancient lineage for the Liberal party of Mr. Gladstone's time by claiming a sort of apostolic descent from the Rockingham Whigs *via* Charles Fox has led the disciples of this creed to imagine that their political ancestors possessed the larger portion of the virtues and wisdom that they regard as their own. Thus, both Sir George Trevelyan and his Gamaliel, reading the history of the eighteenth century through the spectacles of the nineteenth, have overestimated the importance of one small Whig faction, and this attitude seems to colour all their judgments of men and events.

It is an obvious truth that the great Whig party, founded upon the principles of the revolution, was rent into fragments by schism, as every political party must be, as soon as the necessity for its existence came to an end. It was brought into being in order to maintain the Hanoverian succession and to

establish the principle of parliamentary government. Since the first two Georges were content with their Dogeship the last object was regarded as an accomplished fact in the early days of Walpole's long reign of power, while all fear of the Pretender ceased with the *débâcle* of '45. When George the Third ascended the throne, the fight for the spoils of victory had reduced the parliamentary system to a contest between rival factions, and the disorganisation of the great political machine which had manufactured the revolution gave the young king the opportunity of strengthening his prerogative. Unconstitutional though such an attempt may have been, and however disastrous we may consider its consequences, no conscientious historian will contend that the action of the monarch united the scattered forces of the Whigs and welded them once again into a compact and regenerate party. It is impossible to disregard the one paramount truth that they had ceased to represent, as at their origin they had represented, the will of the nation, which regarded the growing despotism of George the Third with lazy tolerance, and looked coldly upon the struggles of the varied factions that opposed his ministers in order to obtain a share of place and power. The mobs of sailormen and weavers that rose in riot from time to time cared nothing for the pretensions of the rival political gangs, breaking heads and windows because they were hungry, without knowing whether the Grenvilles or the Rockinghams ruled in Parliament. Until the American war there was only one great popular upheaval, occasioned by the tyranny of the House of Commons in repudiating the choice of the Middlesex electors, an agitation which owed all its force to the wily dexterity and personal magnetism of John Wilkes.

Apart from the desire to build up a respectable political pedigree, there seems little reason why the Macaulay school should have chosen the Rockingham party from among the heterogeneous minority that opposed the ministers of George the Third as their parliamentary ancestors. Only the imagination of a partisan can detect a resemblance between the principles of this small junto and the dogmas that have been the glory of latter-day Liberalism. It repealed the Stamp Act solely at the dictation of Chatham, who, perceiving its invertebrate character, declined to have any truck with its leader. It treated Wilkes, after he was made an outlaw, with base ingratitude, only espousing his cause later, because the Middlesex

election had become the burning question of the day. Its first brief tenure of office showed it destitute of unity, and though it gained strength in opposition during the American war through the support of Chatham and the adherence of Charles Fox it was never popular with the people of England, who were wise enough to realise that it was only a branch of the old Whig stem, and like the parent trunk had fallen into uselessness and decay. Its one glorious possession was the genius of Edmund Burke.

It is necessary to challenge the pretensions of the Victorian Liberals to an apostolic succession from the Rockingham Whigs because this odd fallacy has tinged the pages of Sir George Trevelyan's new volume upon Fox with the same lurid hues that coloured the one written thirty years ago. Once again he storms at Sandwich and Rigby, Germain and Weymouth, in the same spirit in which he might have declaimed against Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. Smith in defence of Mr. Gladstone. Although we may rejoice that the Georgian politicians are so real to him, it is less satisfactory to note that a distinguished author is reminiscent of the methods of a Stanhope or an Adolphus. The old faults in construction are as apparent as before. The book is called ' George the Third and Charles Fox,' but little is said about the king, and not much more about the statesman. Most of the work is devoted to an account of the American revolution, conceived in the partisan spirit of George Bancroft, interspersed with philippics against the English ministers. Yet no biography will ever be deemed excellent when its hero is not displayed as the central figure, or if the various personages depicted in its pages are served up in turn like the comedians of a music-hall. One may go further, and assert that the historian can make a great advance in his art by studying the methods of the novelist, by telling his story in narrative form, without revealing the wand of the showman, as though it were a real story and not merely a series of quotations from old documents ; by paying due attention to dramatic construction ; and by resuscitating his characters and making them live again as they did actually live before. Doubtless these are high ideals—the methods in fact of Thomas Carlyle—but Sir George Trevelyan attained them in some measure in ' The Early ' History of Charles Fox,' and therein lay the secret of his success. He might have done better still, if he had not been handicapped by the false doctrine of the apostolic succession,

which led him to lose his sense of proportion in the mazes of polemics.

Since the days of George Bancroft historical opinion with regard to the American revolution has been modified, if not entirely changed. The impartial criticism of Lecky and the lapidarian labours of Justin Winsor and his colleagues, have proved that the great revolt was not wholly the result of the sufferings of the colonists, or the oppression and incapacity of English statesmen. One need not belong to the school of historic fatalism to concede that America would have revolted even had Chatham stood in the place of Grenville and Charles Townshend, or if the eloquence of Otis or the statecraft of Samuel Adams had never sown the seeds of rebellion. As in all great wars, the origin of the American revolution was commercial. The restrictions of the navigation laws, which were a direct tax upon colonial trade for the benefit of English merchants and manufacturers, and the ' writs of assistance,' which gave the custom-house officials, under a system of general warrants, the power to search private houses for smuggled goods, had kindled the flames of disloyalty long before George Grenville passed the Stamp Act. Indeed, unless the whole commercial relationship between England and the colonies had been transformed, the rebellion must have occurred within the space of a few years, even had the English parliament surrendered its right to tax America in order to provide a military force for its protection. Yet, the Livery of London, sound Whigs to a man, who, after hostilities had commenced, bombarded George the Third with their petitions, addresses and remonstrances, urging him to dismiss his ministers and stop the war, would have bitterly opposed a repeal of the navigation laws, which was the only means by which the result they desired could have been attained. Doubtless, the English statesmen who insisted upon imposing the various import duties upon the exasperated colonies helped to precipitate the struggle, but their measures, tactless though they now appear, hardly did more to incite the Americans to resistance than the encouragement of their sympathisers in England. ' The American Revo- ' lution was not a quarrel between two peoples,' writes Mellen Chamberlain,* ' but, like all those which mark the progress of

* ' Narrative and Critical History of America,' Justin Winsor, vol. vi. p. 1.

' the British race, it was a strife between two parties, the Con-
' servatives in both countries as one party, and the Liberals
' in both countries as the other party.' With this truth in mind the modern antiquary will have a simple task, if he be a partisan, in apportioning the praise and the blame. If he be impartial, it will help him none the less to poise the scales of historical justice.

Rather than enter into controversy with reference to the conduct of the American war, to which a large portion of Sir George Trevelyan's book is devoted, it is preferable to confine one's attention to the statesman who should be the principal figure in his interesting volume. The bitterest opponents of Charles Fox, both posthumous and contemporary, are agreed as to his personal charm. His sweetness of temper, his intense virility, his sympathetic nature, were a heritage from the great and powerful statesman who begot him—a keen shrewd parvenu, who, by pursuing the sordid game of politics for the sake of money with a vigour that surpassed the most avaricious of his contemporaries, and by committing the unpardonable sin of deserting his party to join his opponents, became in spite of his social virtues more heartily detested than any politician of his day. From his mother—a daughter of the Duke of Richmond, with whom his father had eloped when society still frowned upon him—Fox had inherited the handsome features, the rich colouring and the raven hair of the race of Lennox, in whose veins ran the blood of merry King Charles and Louise de Kerouaille. The favourite child of his parents, from earliest youth nothing was allowed to thwart his wishes. While an Eton schoolboy he paid his first visit to Paris, where Henry Fox, whose relationship to his precocious son resembled that of a vicious elder brother, allowed him to remain for several months, indulging his tastes for gaming and gallantry. At the age of thirteen he was a patron of the playhouse, powdered and coiffured like a man of fashion ; when fifteen he was in residence at Oxford ; he had scarcely turned seventeen when he was touring the Continent as his own master, squandering at Naples alone more than ten thousand pounds. Before he was of age, he was a member of Parliament, and had become a finished rake and a desperate gamester.

Yet, his education had been far from unprofitable. Both at Eton and at Oxford, he was a diligent student, applying himself

to work with an ardour that almost savoured of pedantry, gaining a knowledge of the classics that was remarkable even in the days when gentlemen knew their Horace and Virgil better than their Bible. His Latin verses were gems of scholarship with almost a spark of genius; his ability as a linguist was proved by the ease with which he acquired the French and Italian tongues. More notable than all else, he had displayed rare talent as a schoolboy debater, for he possessed the same ready fluency as his father, combined with a fire and vigour that were his own, showing that nature had made him a great orator. Not even the youthful Pitt cultivated his gifts more assiduously. In all things Charles Fox was a laborious person, a striking example of the truth of the much-disputed adage that defines genius as 'an infinite capacity for taking pains.'

It was in March 1768, at the age of nineteen, that the young politician was returned for the borough of Midhurst in Sussex, a decadent Whig, zealous in support of the Grafton ministry, which seemed destined to hold office as long as it remained obedient to the arbitrary will of George the Third. From the first he showed himself a bitter opponent of the new popular party that championed the cause of John Wilkes. Six years previously while an Eton schoolboy he had listened to the debates in the House of Commons, when the 'North Briton' No. 45 was voted 'a false, seditious, and scandalous libel,' and he was now prepared to speak and vote for the expulsion of 'the 'patriot,' however often the Middlesex electors might return him. Taking his life in his hands, he joined the cavalcade of young bloods that set out with Colonel Luttrell to the hustings at Brentford, an adventure that began with a fierce skirmish amidst the mob at Hyde Park Corner and terminated with the defeat of the ministerial candidate at the poll. His earliest speeches in the House, by which he won a place among the foremost parliamentary orators, were philippics against Wilkes and all his works. Swiftly came his reward, for a year later, when Lord North succeeded Grafton as head of the Government, Fox was appointed one of the lords of the Admiralty.

Never had despotic ministry a more loyal henchman. On every occasion the new recruit was at the service of the Government, pouring a scornful tirade against the complaints of the people, seeming to take a boyish delight in becoming unpopular with the mob. Junius, though he sneered at him as 'yet in

'blossom,' likened his character to that of his *bête noire*, the Duke of Grafton; while 'the patriots,' deeming that the greatest insult they could hurl against him was to remind him that he was the son of 'the public defaulter of unaccounted millions,' gave him the nickname of 'The Young Cub.' We catch a glimpse of him at this period in the full tide of popular odium, leaning out of a coffee-house window in Palace Yard, while an angry crowd surged around Westminster Hall, clamouring for the release of Lord Mayor Crosby, shut up in the Tower on account of an alleged breach of privilege; and when the mob became conscious of the presence of the hated 'black boy,' a roar of execration arose, while Fox, so it was said, shook his fist in their faces, and George Selwyn, who was standing beside him, asked them in derision if he should 'throw him down' to them. Whether the picture be over-coloured or not, it is certain that the young lord of the Admiralty was one of the most unpopular statesmen of the day.

On the other hand, in Parliament and in society no one had more friends. The opposition benches held almost as many of his intimates as the ministerial. Being himself wholly free from rancour, it was not often that he inspired it in others. When John Wilkes, his bitterest foe in politics, was sick of ague at Preston Park, one of his most welcome visitors was 'The 'Young Cub,' who drove out from Brighton in a pony chaise with pretty Lady Barrymore to dine with him. Thus, whenever Fox rose from the Government benches, with black fierce eyes and crimson cheeks, a stout robust figure, wild of gesture and shrill of tongue, to pour forth a torrent of denunciation upon the thin ranks of the minority, the staunchest Whigs felt no resentment against their passionate critic, and, aware that a kindly smile and a warm grasp of the hand was sure to be his greeting to all whom he most abused, would murmur to one another that it was 'only Charles.' And though political life grew far sterner for Fox in after years this same apology—the plea for a chartered libertine—was the one most frequently urged on his behalf. Indeed, it is often used by those who write of him still.

In these early days Charles Fox was famed for the smartness of his attire. The Macaroni craze was at its height, and contemporary caricature displays him in a tall powdered toupee with a heavy queue tied by a broad ribbon, his portly frame

almost bursting through a suit of rich brocade, and a wide bow beneath his chin, for the bucks of his youth were as eccentric in their dress as the dandies of his old age. With women, both virtuous and ungodly, he was a rare favourite, and scandal whispered that his *amourettes* surpassed in number those of Lord March and the Earl of Pembroke. Though fond of his bottle, he was only on occasions an immoderate drinker, and in spite of his bulk was devoted to the sports of the field. Shooting was his greatest joy, while, inspired perhaps by his friend Lord Carlisle, he gained some skill at cricket. 'I am very near the 'best player,' he writes from Kingsgate to a correspondent in the summer of 1771, adding modestly 'so you may judge of the rest.' In partnership with one of the Foleys he commenced horse-racing with some success, winning, it is said, nearly £20,000 at the Burford meeting, in the season of 1772. At Arthur's and at Almack's he was one of the most inveterate patrons of the gaming table, where his ill-luck at hazard and faro soon overwhelmed him with a burden of debt, and when unable to pay his losses he had recourse to the Jews. Though at first his friends hinted that he was a bad loser, his various witticisms at the expense of his creditors show that his joyous temperament was never ruffled for long. Endowed with perfect health, with a stout heart and a light conscience, he drained his cup of pleasure as recklessly as Charles Townshend—the brilliant statesman whom he most resembled.

Early in the year 1772 came the first crisis in his political career. Both of the brothers of George the Third had espoused ladies unacceptable at court, and the indignant king demanded that Parliament should pass a Royal Marriage Act in order to prevent princes of the blood from taking wives of their own choice. A storm of protest arose. The proposed legislation was regarded as a defiance of the laws of nature as well as an insult to the whole British nobility, and the most bitter of all the malcontents was Charles Fox. Twenty years previously his father had been a violent opponent of the Hardwicke Act, which put an end to irregular marriages, regarding the new laws as almost a personal insult, his own wedding having been a clandestine one; and naturally the son, out of loyalty to his parents, would not tolerate any fresh restrictions upon matrimony. Another motive may have influenced the young statesman. His favourite aunt, beautiful Sarah Lennox, had won the

heart of George the Third soon after his accession, and it was a tradition in the family that only scruples of statecraft had prevented the monarch from making her a queen. No one of the name of Fox could be expected to acquiesce in the principle that a member of the royal family should not be free to marry a subject, and in spite of Lord North's efforts to conciliate him Charles tendered his resignation. For a few months he sulked in his tent, and then at last he was persuaded to rejoin the administration as a junior lord of the Treasury, but he had lost all regard for party discipline, and, as though aware that the King would never forgive his antagonism to the Marriage Act, seemed resolved to cause as much embarrassment to the Government as possible, before the inevitable rupture. In 1774 he was dismissed by order of George the Third.

His loss was a severe blow to the ministry, but to Fox himself it appeared to mean political isolation. Upon every issue of politics he was hostile to the Whig opposition ; each of their favourite dogmas had been assailed in turn by his bitter tongue. Fortunately, however, he had taken little interest in American affairs, never advocating coercive measures against the restive colonists, nor wounding their sensibilities by a single harsh word. Luckily also for him there was no period of transition to consign him to stagnation, for the quarrel with Massachusetts flamed into warfare, and he was called upon to make his choice of policy immediately. Seizing the opportunity without hesitation, he hastened to the assistance of his old enemies, the party of Lord Rockingham, and avowed himself a friend and champion of America.

During the next six years he rose to one of the first positions in Parliament. Undoubtedly it was the period at which he reached his zenith. More capable beyond all question in opposition than in office, he had the inspiration of a great cause. In spite of his change of party there is nothing to indicate that his sincerity in condemning the war was less than that of Chatham. While pleading for his kinsmen in the colonies he was far more in sympathy with public opinion than later in his career when he poured forth eulogies in praise of French Jacobinism. Probably, half the nation was at his back, including the greater part of the merchants of London. The mismanagement of the war and the incapacity of the ministry fulfilled his earliest prophecies, giving him an opportunity

almost every week of inveighing against Germain's military preparations or Sandwich's administration of the Admiralty. Of political prescience, however, he showed a strange lack, denying until within a few months of the Declaration of Independence that the Americans were seeking to cut themselves apart from the motherland. It might be urged, also, that while he was earning a reputation as one of the great parliamentary orators of all time, he and his political friends were lending far more assistance to the United States in their struggle against England than all the ships and soldiers of France.

Having taken his place as one of the principal leaders of the brilliant band that waged a fierce opposition to the war, it was inevitable that his opinions should become more modified year by year, transforming him completely from a rabid Tory into a stubborn Whig. Though he did not openly proclaim himself a follower of Lord Rockingham for a considerable period, the philosophy of Burke, his friend and colleague from the earliest days of his apostasy, began to influence his mind from the first. Recognising the insipid character of the leader, and perceiving no doubt, that, save upon the American question, the party inspired no enthusiasm in the country, he delayed a formal alliance until all chance of union or coalition with other groups had passed away. Scarcely, however, had he made the decisive step than he far out-stripped his associates, developing into an extremist, a ' redress of grievances ' politician, surpassing as an agitator even the imperturbable Wilkes in his palmy days of the previous decade. The irony of politics has played few more strange pranks than the metamorphosis of ' The ' Young Cub ' into the idol of the masses with the fearsome title ' The Man of the People.'

Still, he remained the most genial of swashbucklers, never losing a friend, sinking deeper into debt day by day with the best of good humour ; persistent in the enjoyment of wine and women ; racing, hunting, gaming ; seeming to grow more active, both in mind and body as his flesh waxed greater in bulk. With his change of principles came a difference in his mode of dress. The buff and blue of Washington's uniform took the place of the variegated hues of the Macaroni, and the old neatness vanished by degrees, while as the habit of untidiness grew upon him his indifference to clean linen and soap and water was the talk of the town. Among his friends the subject of his old

clothes was a continual jest. Powder and pomatum no longer concealed his black hair, and his unshaven chin and straggling locks provided the favourite laughing-stock of the caricaturists, both graphic and literary. At this period also he discovered a new source of income, setting up a faro bank at Brooks's Club in partnership with Richard Fitzpatrick, which extinguished the old-fashioned game of hazard, and yielded a golden harvest to its lucky proprietors. Apparently, too, this brilliant scheme was regarded as a monopoly by its inventors, for when a rival table was established they waged a merciless war against it till it was broken and overthrown. 'There,' chuckled Fox, 'so 'should all usurpers be served.' In his life as a gamester, it is open to grave doubt whether, as it is generally alleged, he was more sinned against than sinning.

Sir George Trevelyan has not yet finished his narrative of the American war, so it is necessary to anticipate in a few words his final estimate of his hero's place in history. The remaining period of Fox's career is the most difficult for an apologist to write of convincingly. His claim to be regarded as a great statesman must rest upon his policy during his brief tenures of office, and upon his conduct as the leader of the opposition while his country was engaged in its weary struggle with revolutionary France. It is a record of many failures. The sole act of legislation that bears his name was execrated by the vast majority of his countrymen, who believed that the spirit of faction had influenced his whole policy with regard to India. By an utter disregard of his own principles he condemned his party to long years of impotence, fearing to submit to the test of a general election. Upon the Regency question he shocked the nation by proclaiming the obsolete Tory doctrine of divine right in order to win a party advantage at the expense of constitutional government. At the outbreak of the French Revolution his approval of the Jacobins, both at home and abroad, exercised a deep influence upon European politics, giving lasting encouragement to the friends of anarchy, and sowing the seeds of discord among those who were striving to stem its tide. Year after year his narrow prejudices and his sympathy with the enemies of his country deterred him from joining hands with the English ministers when there was need for the help of every patriotic citizen. His great popularity in France shows how deeply he outraged the sentiments of his

native land. Modern cant urges his large-hearted toleration in vain, forgetting that patriotism was regarded as a real virtue in the eighteenth century, and that every statesman must be judged by the spirit of his age. If a hundred years hence the whole world is ruled by the doctrines of Karl Marx, rational critics will not then rate Mr. Asquith any lower because he did not, in 1912, speak the language of a Hyde Park demagogue. Practical politics sets limits to the aspirations of the philanthropist, and those in places of trust who make mischief by quarrelling with their environment are visionaries, not statesmen.

Latter-day Whigs have long made a fetish of Charles Fox—claiming for him an equal rank with Walpole and Chatham, Peel and Gladstone—and his position as a statesman has in consequence been rated too high. Although he had all the qualities that should have given him a place in the first rank—a great intellect, a clear judgment, undaunted courage, together with perfect health and lofty eloquence—he never won the confidence of the nation, and in spite of his fine sentiments in praise of liberty and toleration, it is doubtful whether he would have been more successful under the franchise of the present day. To the lack of that elusive quality that we call character, which is perhaps the essence of all the others, this failure is usually attributed. It is doubtful, however, whether this is the real explanation. The most immoral of lives did not prevent John Wilkes from remaining the idol of the people as long as he chose to whistle them to heel ; a habit of tippling had no effect upon the prestige of William Pitt ; nor did Chatham fall in popular esteem because he was a reckless spendthrift. Charles Townshend, who combined all these vices, was a great political force, and might have reached the highest pinnacle, but for his untimely death. Of earnestness, perseverance, integrity, Fox possessed a full measure, while it was the boast of his friends that his word was as good as his bond. He was known to be absolutely incorruptible ; he was deemed incapable of a lie. But he was wholly destitute of political sagacity—the instinct to do the right thing at the right moment—without which a statesman can make no permanent impression upon his age. Each red herring drawn across his path led him aside in hot chase, and though his sincerity was often unquestionable, he invariably gave the impression of opportunism. His hasty coalition with Lord North, his futile impeachment of Hastings,

his encouragement of mutiny and sedition at the darkest hour of national danger, were fatal errors which ruined his party as an effective force, and did nothing to promote the principles that he professed. Thus, it is only as an orator and a debater that he can be regarded as supreme, for owing to his ill-success as a leader of men no triumph of statecraft stands to his credit in the statute-book. For many years after the outbreak of the French Revolution he seems to live in a false theatrical atmosphere of Jacobinism, a mere talking-machine pouring forth pæans in praise of abstract principles, above all things a marplot utilising the embarrassments of his country to score a party triumph. It is strange that his contemporaries were unable to resist the pun—*Fox et praeterea nihil*. Of late, historical criticism has had many dealings with him and with his great rival, and those who look upon their statues may judge of the relative proportions of the two men. The figure of William Pitt appears nobler and more colossal as the fierce glare that beats upon it reveals it more clearly to the eye, while the false glamour that used to transfigure the effigy of Charles Fox fades away before the light of truth.

HORACE BLEACKLEY.

THE ROUSSEAU BICENTENARY

1. **Vie de Rousseau.** Par ÉMILE FAGUET. Société française d'imprimerie et de librairie. 1911.
2. **Jean-Jacques Rousseau.** Par JULES LEMAÎTRE. Calmann-Lévy. 1908.
3. **J.-J. Rousseau : A Criticism.** By FREDERIKA MACDONALD. Chapman and Hall. 1907.

AT the time of the Dickens Centenary one heard the protest that centenaries came too soon ; that a longer time must elapse before one could take the true measure of a great reputation and be sure of distinguishing between a fashion and a force. Rousseau's centenary fell in the year in which Napoleon marched to catastrophe at Moscow—a time when people had many things to think about besides philosophy and literature ; and it would certainly have been difficult for critics at that date to make up their minds whether his influence was destined to be transitory or permanent. The most unlikely persons, indeed, were still watering the pages of 'La nouvelle 'Héloïse' with the warm tears of sensibility. Even Billaud-Varennes, the transported Terrorist, wept over its pathos in penal servitude at Cayenne ; but the new school of emotional fiction which that romance inspired was only beginning to give its proofs. Nor was it yet clear whether the 'Contrat 'Social' and the 'Discours sur l'Inégalité' had marked an epoch in political thought, or merely furnished formulae to a particular group of revolutionists whose work, already half undone by a military despot, was soon to be destroyed by the reactionary sovereigns and statesmen who founded the Holy Alliance.

All that was uncertain in 1812, and for long afterwards. It may be added that it was not until long after the centenary that it was even possible to distinguish truth, from romance on the one hand, and slander on the other, in the records of Rousseau's life. Lord Morley, with all his acumen and discrimination, failed, through no fault of his own, to do so. He based the case against Rousseau on Mme. d'Épinay's 'Mémoires' ; and he accepted from the 'Confessions' the idyllic story of Jean-Jacques' life with Mme. de Warens at

Les Charmettes. It has since been demonstrated by Miss Macdonald that Mme. d'Épinay's 'Mémoires' were doctored by Grimm and Diderot for the express purpose of holding Jean-Jacques up to contempt and ridicule; and it has further been shown by M. Mugnier in 'Madame de Warens et Jean-'Jacques Rousseau' that the Charmettes idyll is a fond thing vainly invented—a magnificent edifice of fiction reared upon the flimsiest foundation of fact. Consequently, it is only the biographers who have written subsequently to these discoveries and others like them, who have really been in a position to depict Rousseau without either idealising or caricaturing him.

Whether they have all succeeded is another question; and we are inclined to think that only M. Faguet has done so. He is not the most vivid of the biographers; but he is the most anxious to be fair: the one who starts encumbered with the fewest preconceptions. He is not a hero-worshipper, like Miss Macdonald, who, beginning with the assumption that Rousseau was great and good, concludes, without the help of any other evidence, that he must have been mistaken in supposing that he had deposited his children at the door of the Foundling Hospital. On the other hand, he is free from the malice of M. Lemaître, who despises Rousseau as a sentimentalist, detests him as a political innovator, and is chiefly concerned, when writing of him, to defend Catholic and legitimist doctrines with the shafts of a Voltairean wit. M. Faguet's purpose is the more modest one of disentangling the ravelled skein of conflicting testimony; and he disentangles it in the light and airy style of Mr. Justice Darling summing up in a breach of promise case. He makes us smile, but he persuades us; whereas the broader fun of M. Lemaître's work is as unconvincing as a farcical comedy. It is in M. Faguet's pages, in short, that we not only get at the rights of Rousseau's many squabbles with his friends and patrons, but also—which is, of course, more important—are helped to pick out those salient facts in his education, circumstances, and career, which made him so different not only from other men but also from other philosophers.

Rousseau's genius must be, as they say in Academic circles, 'posited.' If he had not been a man of genius, his personality would long since have been forgotten, and his countrymen would not be singing hymns to him in the Panthéon, two

hundred years after his birth. So much is common ground among his friends, his enemies, and his impartial judges. All alike recognise his writings as a cause from which great effects sprang—much greater effects than he lived to see or consciously aimed at—in more than one department of human endeavour. One may vote his fiction unreadable; but one has to admit that it founded a school which came to prevail, not in France only, but throughout Europe. One may declare his political philosophy unsound and his political opinions deplorable; but the fact remains that they shook society to its foundations, and continued to exert their influence long after the Revolution which they made had been trampled under the iron heel of the legions of the 'Holy Three.' There were many men among his contemporaries of stronger character and acuter intellect, who were far less successful in capturing the popular imagination and influencing the popular mind—Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, and d'Alembert, for instance. We may set ourselves, and solve with M. Faguet's help, the problem: How was it that Rousseau, with an equipment and endowment apparently inferior to theirs, accomplished so much more?

M. Lemaître appears to take the view that he accomplished it by accident, and with his tongue in his cheek: first making a paradoxical attack on the fine arts in compliance with the ingenious suggestion of Diderot; then, surprised at his own success, casting about for another paradox to champion; astonishing the world a second time with his famous 'Discourse 'on Inequality,' and then deliberately adopting the pose of 'the man of his book.' But that theory will not do. It makes of Rousseau a kind of eighteenth century Oscar Wilde; and men of that calibre, though they dazzle and puzzle the world, never acquire any enduring status as evangelists. Rousseau may sometimes have said rather more than he meant, and enthusiasts may sometimes have credited him with meaning rather more than he said; but, on the whole, he was in earnest, and wrote as he did write, not with any idea of giving the public what it wanted, but because he was the sort of man to whom it had become natural to write like that. Hence the importance of considering exactly how his genius was canalised by circumstance and opportunity.

The first fact which it is essential to lay hold of is that he

was a man of genius who was not brought up according to the rules—did not, that is to say, receive the French eighteenth-century equivalent of a public school and university education. So far as mere instruction went, the difference may have mattered little. Rousseau read the same books as the Encyclopædists, and learnt, in his own way, pretty much what they learnt in theirs. Learning it in his own way, however, he escaped the influence of the freemasonry which makes one conventionally educated man so much like another conventionally educated man, and bands all conventionally educated men together in support of certain vested social and intellectual interests. He was equipped with the weapons of the philosophers, but did not own allegiance to them. His training had taught him how to think, but no teachers had ever told him what to think. It did not follow, of course, that his thoughts would necessarily take a revolutionary turn ; but he had no ingrained prejudices to hinder them from doing so. He was the more likely to strike out new ideas and evolve new doctrines because he was so little embarrassed with old ones.

In particular, he had received a sentimental education which was not in accordance with the rules ; he had reached, that is to say, the age of thirty, without any training in the methods and traditions of eighteenth-century gallantry. The essence of that gallantry was a grand manner, an elaborate make-believe, an artificiality more suggestive of drawing-room comedy than of the passions of real life, a conception of woman solely as the perpetual objective of a well-regulated pursuit, an inability to discover the real woman beneath the mask of the coquette, to credit her with sincere emotions of her own, or to recognise that she also might have a point of view. Rousseau came rather late in life into a world in which that theory and practice of gallantry prevailed, and tried, for a time—being weak and imitative and not at all sure of himself—to adapt himself to its ways. But he came to it as a simple-minded young man from the country, schooled by the simpler women of the country, by Madame de Warens, and Madame Larnage, and the maid Merceret, and others. He was a sentimentalist who, having no sense of humour, was not in the least ashamed of being sentimental. To this he owed, as we shall see, a great deal of his originality, and also a great deal of his popularity.

He was admitted, we must next remember, to the best society of his time, but came to it comparatively late, and only entered it as, in our modern language, an 'outsider.' He had an engaging address which easily brought him friends; but he could not catch the tone or adopt the manners of his new acquaintances. He was at once very sensitive, and very *gauche*. Awkward things happened, and the memory of their awkwardness rankled. He could not forget that he had once been a domestic servant—that, as a private tutor, he had secretly guzzled his employer's wine—that the first great Parisian lady to whom he presented a letter of introduction had invited him to stay to dinner in the servants' hall. Thereafter, though many great ladies petted him, and many noblemen flattered and patronised him, he was always suspiciously on the look-out for social slights, always self-conscious, always making up his mind that he must stand on his dignity, continually finding that his balance was insecure.

His difficulties in that respect were indubitably increased by his relations with his 'companion,' Thérèse Levasseur, whom he took from her position as needlewoman in an *hôtel meublé* and lived with for the remainder of his life. The influence of Thérèse alike on him and on his career may, indeed, be cited as a typical example of the drawbacks of that habit of *collage* which M. Brieux has exposed so amusingly in 'Les 'Hannetons': not the less so because the morality of the time was tolerant, and great ladies like Madame d'Épinay and the Maréchale de Luxembourg accepted the situation and were quite nice about Thérèse—how nice one can only appreciate by imagining an English analogy, in which of course the names of living persons must be avoided.

Let us then, for the names of Rousseau and the Maréchale de Luxembourg, substitute those of Carlyle and Lady Ashburton; and let us imagine Carlyle a middle-aged, unmarried man, known by all the world to be living matrimonially with a chambermaid whom he had picked up in an equivocal Bloomsbury boarding house. Can we next go on to imagine Lady Ashburton proposing to Carlyle that he and the chambermaid and the chambermaid's unpresentable, not to say disreputable, mother should set up house together in a cottage in her Park? Can we further imagine Lady Ashburton calling on the chambermaid in that cottage, and

sending compliments and kind regards to her in all her letters ? Of course we can imagine nothing of the kind ; but we have, in fact, to imagine all that and more of the same kind if we really wish to visualise the affable attitude of French society towards Jean-Jacques and Mlle. Levasseur. It was toleration run mad, and yet it did not answer.

It might have answered if Thérèse had been intelligent and adaptable, or if she had been docile and submissive ; but though she possessed certain virtues, neither docility nor intelligence was included in their number. The one merit which cannot be denied to her is a dog-like fidelity akin to that of the lady who vowed that she would never desert Mr. Micawber ; but it is difficult to discover any others. Absolutely uneducated when Jean-Jacques took her to be his consort, she resisted all his attempts to educate her. She could hardly read ; she could not even tell the time by the clock. Her competence in spelling may be measured by the fact that when, as a widow, she wished to describe herself as 'femme de Jean-Jacques,' she wrote the words 'fameu du 'gangaque.' Moreover, she was tactless, bad-tempered, and a mischief-maker. When great ladies received Jean-Jacques on terms of social equality in their country houses, Thérèse, whom they did not receive, frequented their servants' halls, and gossiped with the maids and footmen. When, as sometimes happened, she lived with Jean-Jacques in a country house in the absence of its owner, she never failed to scold the servants till they rose in mutiny against her.

Thérèse, in short, was, from every point of view, 'impossible' ; but the worst of all her faults was her incorrigible habit of embroiling Jean-Jacques with his friends. Destitute of intellectual resources and deprived of social opportunities, she lived in the same queer imaginative world as those modern women of the lower orders who feed their minds on police reports and penny novelettes. She never could believe that anything was what it seemed to be, and saw nothing all around her but dark conspiracy and mysterious intrigue. As Jean-Jacques' friends were the people whom she most frequently met, it was they who chiefly figured as conspirators in her eyes. She attributed the most sinister motives to their most innocent actions and significantly warned Jean-Jacques to beware of them. In doing so she attacked him at a weak point,

for he was already by nature suspicious—though not, unfortunately, of her. Though he thought that he knew women—and did indeed know a good deal about women of a better class—he entirely failed to read that particular woman's mind. It never occurred to him that she might be imagining, inventing, or even lying. It never occurred to him to test or sift her statements. On the contrary, he treated whatever she told him to the detriment of his friends as valuable information acquired from unimpeachable sources, on which it was imperative to act at once. Hence his quarrels with his friends, his increasing conviction that no friend—unless it were, perhaps, a benevolent woman—was to be trusted, and his ultimate fixed idea that all the world was in a league to persecute him.

For that fixed idea, no doubt, there are other contributory causes to be assigned: suppressed gout and cerebral lesion may both have played their part in it. Jean-Jacques, in short, for considerable periods of his life was almost mad enough to be locked up; and no fair-minded person can accuse Thérèse of having driven him mad. None the less, however, her termagant ways created an atmosphere unfavourable to his sanity, and, by compelling him to live more and more aloof from his fellows, evolved the conditions in which his genius escaped from Academic and Encyclopaedic influences, and manifested itself in forms of startling originality. He began, indeed, by doing work, such as articles for the Encyclopædia and the like, which almost any other clever man might have done; but all of a sudden we find him doing other work, alike in fiction and in philosophy, quite different from anything that had ever been done, in France at all events, before. We will glance first at his fiction, carefully guarding ourselves against one error into which there is a great temptation to fall.

We must not, that is to say, depreciate 'La nouvelle Héloïse' simply because we find it unreadable. Though it is unreadable now, it was very readable a hundred years ago, as the warm tears shed over its pathos by Billaud-Varennes in his penal settlement attest; and in gradually becoming unreadable through the lapse of time it has only shared the fate of almost all novels of the genus to which it belongs. Appeals to sentiment are, of all literary appeals, those which most quickly

come to seem old-fashioned and unreal; partly, perhaps, through some subtle change in the connotation of the words in which they are couched, but chiefly because the world's scale of sentimental values is continually being modified. A surfeit of stale sentiment is even more cloying than a surfeit of stale jokes. The melting pathos of one generation comes to seem a roaring farce to the next; and it needs but a little change in the mental attitude of the reader to make a masterpiece of sentiment—or perhaps one should say of sentimentalism—read like its own parody.

That has been the fate of Rousseau's fiction, as it has been the fate of Richardson's—and Richardson was Rousseau's model in so far as he can be said to have had one. Just as Richardson's work nowadays seems absurd whereas Fielding's work still seems real, so Rousseau's work reads like an echo from an age which has passed away, whereas Voltaire's intellectual rapier play can still entertain us pretty much as it entertained our forefathers. But Richardson's and Rousseau's writings were just as important at their respective dates as Fielding's and Voltaire's; and, whatever may be the case with Richardson, Rousseau's work exercised a far more potent influence than Voltaire's upon the subsequent development of imaginative literature in Europe. Voltaire, for all his brilliance, was only working an old mine. Rousseau discovered a new mine, and extracted a new treasure from it. His work marks a distinct stage in the attitude of novelists towards life, and more particularly towards the relations of men and women.

Those relations, after they became formal and ceremonious—after, that is to say, they got beyond the point illustrated by such stories as that of the 'Rape of the Sabines'—may be said to have passed through three separate and well-defined stages: the stages of chivalry, gallantry, and sentiment. Chivalry was the note of the Middle Ages; gallantry the note of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; sentiment succeeded gallantry at about the time when the eighteenth century reached its grand climacteric. Broadly speaking, we may say that Voltaire's work marks the end of the age of gallantry, and Rousseau's work the inauguration of the age of sentiment. Rousseau, that is to say, started that revolt of the heart against the intellect which is one of the two

most salient characteristics of the Romantic movement in literature.

The other salient characteristic of that movement is subjectivity—the deliberate sounding of the personal note—the conscious use of literature, not merely as a medium for the conveying of ideas, but as a mode of self-expression, and the insistence of the personality of the writer as the host at the literary feast which he offers. In this respect also Rousseau may be saluted as the pioneer. If he only appears in the *rôle* unobtrusively, and by implication, in 'La nouvelle Héloïse,' he may be said formally to have created the part in his 'Confessions,' which have far more value as a work of the imagination than as a record of events.

The philosophers maintained, and probably believed, that he wrote those 'Confessions' merely for the purpose of blackening the characters of his friends and patrons—that he only blackened his own character incidentally in order, by this cunning rhetorical trick, to give plausibility to his calumnious references to others. They pictured him as the dog of Diogenes turning to bite the hands which had fed it; and no doubt there is a good deal in the book to convey and warrant that impression. That, however, was a partial and one-sided view; and we who study the book to-day must judge the author not by his intentions but by his achievement. Like all great builders, he builded better than he knew. Even if he only intended a libel, or a *tu quoque* in reply to a libel, he unmistakably achieved a work of art, and a work of art of a new kind—a work of art which takes its place in literature as a marvellous piece of self-revelation.

Previous autobiographies had been constructed on quite other lines and had given quite other impressions. Their interest depended, not upon the personality of the autobiographer, but upon the great things which he had done or the great events with which he had been in contact. Autobiographies of that kind still flourish. They are often entertaining as miscellanies of scandalous or piquant anecdote, and sometimes have their value as historical documents. Rousseau's 'Confessions' neither possess that value nor afford that entertainment. Whatever the autobiographer's motives—which may very well have been mixed—the significance of the autobiography itself lies in the fact that it is the first great

example in literature of the manifesto of a personality—that it reveals a writer boldly claiming that the world shall take an interest in him, not for what he has done, but for what he is.

From that point of view Rousseau was assuredly a literary ancestor with a numerous progeny; his literary descendants principally differing from him in displaying less candour, more vanity, and better taste. The 'Confessions,' for all their pose, retain a *naïveté* which was presently to disappear from this kind of literature; their author asserts that he was virtuous, and proves that he was not. He posed, in short, as an amateur, whereas Chateaubriand and Lamartine posed as past masters of the art of posing; but his pose was nevertheless the source of their inspiration, and they knew it, and acknowledged it, though they never tired of drawing attention to the various ways in which they had improved upon their original, suggesting, or even insisting, that the self-revelation was equally complete in their cases, but that the personality revealed was finer and more spectacular.

That, in particular, was Chateaubriand's line in the 'Mémoires d'Outre-tombe.' He does not apologise for himself, because he feels that he has nothing to apologise for. He claims all Rousseau's sensibility, but—there are innumerable 'buts.' He is not, like Jean-Jacques, a *parvenu*, but is of noble birth. He has never, like Jean-Jacques, stolen a piece of ribbon and thrown the blame upon a maid-servant. He has never, like Jean-Jacques, sent illegitimate children to a Foundling Hospital. He has never, like Jean-Jacques, been a pensioner on the bounty of the great; he has never treated any woman as Rousseau had treated Madame de Warens, and would scorn to make a boast of any lady's favours.

Similarly with Lamartine in his various Memoirs and Confidences. He too claims to have been like Rousseau, but with differences—all in his own favour. The influence in his case, indeed, was so great as to provoke something very much akin to plagiarism. He practically annexes incidents from 'La nouvelle Héloïse' and from the 'Confessions' and attributes them to his hero or to himself. The wreck story of 'La nouvelle Héloïse' reappears in 'Raphaël,' and the Memoirs relate an incident obviously inspired by the idyll—so largely imaginary—of 'Les Charmettes.' The only

difference is that, in the case of Lamartine, alike in fiction and in reminiscence, temptation is resisted and virtue triumphs. To put it briefly, just as Chateaubriand represents himself as a noble and spectacular Rousseau, so Lamartine asks us to accept him as a mooning and innocent Rousseau.

Nor is that the whole of the influence, or the end of it. The double influence, hardly separable, of subjectivity and sentimentalism is not only to be discerned in formal autobiography. Its ramifications can be traced in many kinds of literature, and extended through many countries. We can discover it in Goethe and Byron. We find the influence of the subjectivity most conspicuously apparent in certain novels by men which are really autobiographical fragments, such as Sénancour's 'Obermann' and Benjamin Constant's 'Adolphe'; while the influence of the sentimentalism dominates the fiction produced by women during the first thirty or forty years of the nineteenth century, and was the unmistakable source of Madame de Staël's 'Corinne' and nearly all the works of George Sand's first period. Along these channels we can follow the influence of Rousseau through the whole subsequent development of fiction.

The effect which most insistently attracts attention is the stimulus which he gave, on the emotional side at all events, to the movement which we now call feminism. Jean-Jacques was not, it is true, a feminist in the sense in which modern women understand the word. He did not minimise the natural differences between men and women. His attitude towards that branch of the subject was pretty much the same as Tennyson's. The epicene woman and the violent woman would have found equally little favour in his eyes. It never occurred to him that it was desirable for women to be anything but womanly. His new departure only consisted in taking the womanly woman seriously, regarding her primarily as an individual and only secondarily as an object of man's desires, and trying to look at her life from her own point of view. He was, that is to say, 'sympathetic'—which is another way of saying, what we have already said, that he substituted sentiment for gallantry.

And women were grateful—more grateful than they had ever been to any previous writer—and soon began to pay him

the sincere flattery of imitation. 'A woman of true sensi-
'bility,' Madame de Blot told the Duc de Chartres, 'would
'require to be of very superior virtue indeed not to be willing
'to consecrate her life to Rousseau if she could be sure that
'he loved her passionately.' That was one tribute, sincerely offered no doubt, though the necessity for paying it never arose. The other tribute, which more immediately concerns us, consisted in the amplification of his thesis by many generations of women novelists—with whom male novelists have sometimes allied themselves—each clamouring more emphatically than the last for the right of every woman to be an 'individual' and to 'live her own life' in her own way. Even the feminism of Ibsen, in short, may be said to have its root in the feminism of Rousseau, though Rousseau would almost certainly have repudiated Ibsen as a disciple.

Feminism, however, is only a part, though a very important part, of the Romantic movement. The essence of Romanticism is the introduction of the personal note, which may or may not be a feminine note in any given instance: it is the conception of literature as something depending for its value not merely upon intellectual ingenuity, and eloquence and purity of style, but also, as Professor Brandes has so well demonstrated in his 'Main Currents of Nineteenth Century Litera-
'ture,' upon some individual contribution consciously brought to the feast of reason by the writer, upon some new way of looking at things, or of getting at their inner meaning, or some new emotional experience, which only that particular personality could have provided. Rousseau, it may well be, did not realise that the note was a new one, or that he was sounding it; but it was in his utterances that it first became noticeably audible, and imaginative literature has never since been able to dispense with it.

It is a note, of course, which varies in its tone from individual to individual and from age to age. It is heard as a note of morbid disillusion and world-weary *ennui* in such works as 'Obermann' and 'René.' It swells to bombastic enthusiasm in Ramond's account of his sentimental journeys in the Pyrénées, where we see him seeking shelter from the storm under a rock and there meditating on the perfectibility of human nature and the roseate prospects of the regeneration of mankind by the principles of 1789. It sinks to a melodious wail in that

tearful period of which Lamartine is the prophet. It expresses unbridled and anarchical passion in George Sand's eloquent plea that whatever a woman does is right provided that she 'feels good' when she is doing it. It is recognisable, though muffled, in the so-called 'pessimism' of Alfred de Vigny; and it becomes a piercing shriek in the frenzy of some of the other Romantics of the thirties.

But that is not all. The personal note which we have traced to Rousseau did not disappear when the Romantic Movement died. It was, on the contrary—to change the metaphor—the torch which the Romantics handed on to the Realists in the great Literary Lampadephoria. For the common conception of Realism as something antagonistic to Romanticism—something which fought Romanticism and overthrew it—is a mistaken one. The antithesis of Romanticism is not Realism, but formalism and conventionalism. Romanticism is, in truth, a first attempt at Realism; and Realism is largely an extension of Romanticism into other fields. To both alike the definition of the literary art as 'life seen through a temperament' is applicable. To pass from the one to the other, all that was requisite was a widening of the field of vision.

The first Romantics, being only beginners, saw only themselves through their temperaments. They were much impressed by what they saw, and made a tremendous fuss about it. They placed themselves in the centre of the stage—sometimes as heroic, sometimes as dolorous, figures. The limelight streamed on them; everything else in the picture was vague and shadowy; their subordinate characters were never definite. The Realists looked further, with clearer eyes, and a livelier, and more minute, curiosity. Taking themselves more or less for granted, they examined their fellow creatures through their temperaments. So that, in the end, the difference between the two schools seems to amount pretty much to this. The Romantic strikes an attitude, folding his arms, and posing, and exclaims 'Myself—*as I really am!*' The Realist strikes a different kind of attitude—quite as superior in spite of the difference—and points, like a disdainful showman, saying 'My neighbours—*as they really are—or, at all events, as they appear to me!*'

But that again is not all. *Nihil per saltum* is an aphorism which is still seen to hold good when we follow the process of

literary evolution through yet another stage. The transition which we have remarked is the transition, let us say, from Lamartine to Balzac, or from George Sand to her young friend Flaubert, and his disciple Guy de Maupassant. These writers inspected their fellow creatures individually through their respective temperaments, incidentally revealing themselves while doing so, in spite of their assumption of impartial and scientific aloofness. It remained for another great writer to inspect mankind, and tell us what his temperament made of them, in groups, or even in crowds. That is the stage marked by the arrival of Zola.

Zola did not, any more than the others, know exactly what he was doing. He set out, in fact, with the avowed intention of doing something quite different. He had heard of heredity —he had read an immense medical treatise on heredity— it seemed to him a happy thought to illustrate the truths of heredity in fiction. He not only tried to do this but kept up to the end the pretence, first that he was doing it, and then that he had done it. To his readers however it soon became apparent that the complicated plan which he had traced for his work was not the idea which was inspiring it ; that he had in fact forgotten all about heredity in his passionate desire to depict the psychology of the crowd, whether of miners as in ' Germinal,' of peasants as in ' La Terre,' of financiers as in ' L'Argent,' or of soldiers as in ' La Débâcle.' Assuredly he had got a long way from Rousseau when he was doing that ; but in making his picture of his crowds a picture of ' life seen ' through a temperament,' he was, in a sense, under the influence of Rousseau, though that influence had passed through many modifying filters before reaching him.

So much for Rousseau's far-reaching influence on the literary side : an influence which remains, though most of us keep ' La nouvelle Héloïse ' (if we keep it at all) on the dusty upper shelf of the book-case consecrated to the works which we coldly respect but could only read through with infinite boredom under strong compulsion. His political influence was, if anything, even more immediate and more obvious. It is hardly too much to say that he preached a Gospel— often spoken of as the Fifth Gospel, or the Gospel according to Jean-Jacques—which changed the face of Europe. The leaders of the French Revolution said so, and showed that

they meant what they said, by taking his body from its humble grave at Erménonville, and re-interring it with the reverent pomp in which the French excel in that Panthéon on whose portals is carved the legend *Aux grands hommes la patrie reconnaissante.* The recent memorial ceremony, not less solemn and splendid, in the same building, is a sufficient indication that he is still recognised as a great thinker whose thoughts inspired great deeds—a prophet and a leader of men. Yet here again the effect seems, at the first blush, altogether incommensurate with the cause.

One cannot make out from any of the 'Lives of Rousseau'—not even from those written by his warmest admirers—that he had in him any of the stuff of which leaders of men are made, the stuff which one expects to find in the preacher of a crusade, no less than in the crusader, in Peter the Hermit, no less than in Godefroi de Bouillon. He was a timorous creature, always running away and hiding: a preacher who suffered from 'agorophobia'—which is a rare complaint with preachers. Though he wrote fiery and formidable 'Letters from the 'Mountain' he did not himself descend into the plain until the mountaineers began to throw stones at his windows; and then he descended stealthily, and lay low and said nothing, first on an island on the Lake of Bienne, and afterwards in the various country houses lent to him by the benefactors of philosophy and the arts. One might almost describe him, at this later period of his career, in the language which an angry politician applied to a modern leader, as 'a nice old 'gentleman for a small tea-party.' Grimm gives us a glimpse of him in that character:

> He goes out a good deal, and is to be seen at the houses of fashionable ladies. He sups sometimes too with Sophie Arnould, and an elegant company of *petits-maîtres* and *talons rouges.* Rulhière is the guide who takes him about. A good many inquisitive people have been to call on him—among others, the Prince de Ligne.

That was at the beginning of his last long sojourn in Paris. The leaders of society presently dropped him, as they are apt to drop the lion of a season who is not really one of their own set. He did not mind, but was quite content to walk about the Bois de Boulogne with Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, from whose records we derive most of our knowledge of his last years. We gather from those records that he attached

no importance whatever to his contributions to philosophic thought, and never, for a moment, cradled himself with the hope that they would make his name immortal. His concern, to the last, was for his personality rather than for his work: with what he was, rather than with what he had done. He did not seek to know whether the world had been converted by his doctrines; he merely begged his callers to tell him whether the world accepted him as a pattern of the domestic virtues or spoke evil of him behind his back. As for his writings in general, his most memorable dictum was: 'If there 'is one thing that I can boast of, it is that I began to write late, 'and ceased to write early.' Asked about the 'Contrat Social,' in particular, he shrugged his shoulders, saying 'The people 'who claim to understand it are much cleverer than I am.'

Perhaps they were; for genius is dissociated from cleverness almost as frequently as cleverness is found without genius. Rousseau was the man of genius building better than he knew, never suspecting that the structure which he had knocked up in a hurry had enduring value and strength to resist the ravages of time. Its strength and value, indeed, could only be tested by experiment; and it was so tested, consciously and deliberately, by the revolutionists of the next generation, whose proceedings display a curious blend of sentimentalism and hard-headedness. They stood towards the founder of their faith pretty much in the relation in which the engineer stands towards the mathematician, or the religious organiser towards the preacher. They not only quoted the Gospel according to Jean-Jacques but applied it; they applied it not only in principle but in detail; and it is noteworthy that they were able to quote it not only in the name of Liberty but also in the name of Martial Law, finding in it not only the justification for the sacred principles of 1789 but also the warrant for the fury with which the Revolution devoured its own children.

As political philosophy, no doubt, both the 'Contrat Social' and the 'Discours sur l'Inégalité' leave a great deal to be desired. In some respects, indeed, the principles of the two works are mutually destructive; and the principles which survive that internecine struggle can be torn to pieces by brilliant controversialists like M. Lemaître in a way in which the principles of Montesquieu, for instance, can not. Rousseau propounded a theory of the origin of organised government

which is demonstrably unhistorical. It is not true that 'man ' is born free and is everywhere in chains.' It is not true that there ever was a social contract to which all the citizens were parties, whereby the several parties to the contract agreed to resign individual rights with a view to the collective advantage to be derived from a settled state of law and order. And, of course, if a contract has never been concluded, the case for tearing it up vanishes into the thinnest of thin air. All that is true—all that has been demonstrated in dozens of treatises—and all that does not matter. Or, at all events, it did not matter in France on the eve of the Revolution.

There were innumerable reasons why a revolution was becoming inevitable in France. Its outbreak was predicted by innumerable impartial observers, from Lord Chesterfield to Arthur Young, who saw the grievances of the people but saw no prospect of their redress except through a national upheaval. It cannot be maintained that Rousseau created the indignation any more than he created the grievances. At the same time, he did a good deal more than express the indignation. He gave it philosophic (or apparently philosophic) shape and substance; he deduced it, with pitiless logic, from assumptions which the aggrieved gladly granted and never thought of asking him to prove.

In England that would have mattered little; in France it mattered immensely, for the one thing which the average Frenchman requires before he can proceed to effective action is a formula. Without a formula he feels as helpless as a short-sighted man who has mislaid his spectacles. Give him a formula, and an emotion to impel him to apply it violently, and he feels that he has a lever with which he can move the world. Jean-Jacques not only stirred up the emotions of the French revolutionaries—which, in fact, needed little stirring—but also provided them with the formula they wanted, with the lever needed for their work. That was the great achievement—the importance of which Carlyle, in his comments on Rousseau's work, unaccountably missed.

Carlyle, as we all know, in one of those hasty high-sounding generalisations which are, as it were, the *leit-motifs* of his poetical 'History of the French Revolution,' speaks, over and over again, of the 'swallowing of formulae' as the great characteristic of the period; but if formulae were, in fact,

swallowed at that time, it was by other formulae that they were devoured, and those other formulae were taken from the 'Contrat Social.' Not the failure, in short, but the triumph of formulae is the distinguishing feature of the Revolution. When the King said 'This is a revolt,' and his minister replied 'Sire, it is a Revolution,' it was really the use by the rebels of Rousseau's formulae which marked the difference between the two kinds of disturbance. A revolution, indeed, might almost be defined as a successful revolt depending upon, or at least consciously and logically related to, formulae. The application of the formulae, with a roughness which their author never dreamt of, made the Revolution so thorough and so scientific that counter-revolutions have been powerless to undo its work.

People sometimes talk of the French Revolution as if its work had been solely, or at any rate mainly, destructive. It was just as much constructive; and it constructed, as well as destroyed, on the lines which Rousseau's formulae prescribed. It not only tore up an old theory of sovereignty —the medieval doctrine of the divine right of kings; it also produced a new one. And the new doctrine was no mere skeleton theory but had all its details elaborately filled in. Rousseau's theoretical principle of the 'collective will' became, in practice, the doctrine of the divine (or at all events the indisputable) right of majorities: the right, one may almost say, of any Jack-in-office to govern wrong, provided that he owes his office to universal suffrage. There were clauses in the charter which expressly justified the persecution of Atheists and Roman Catholics not on religious but on political grounds, because they were, and were bound to be, 'bad 'citizens'—clauses which could be invoked by the Terrorists as effectively as by the social reformers. So we hear from Mallet du Pan that Marat used often to 'read and comment 'upon "Le Contrat Social" in public places amid the plaudits 'of an enthusiastic audience'; and he and Robespierre, taking the book for their Bible, cut off heads not only in the sacred cause of liberty but also in the cause, hardly less sacred to them, of logical completeness.

Up to that point—up to Thermidor, and perhaps up to Brumaire—the course of Rousseau's influence, whether one likes or dislikes it, can be traced so clearly that there really is little to argue about. When we follow history further, the

line between his influence and that of the Revolution—between, that is to say, the idea and the event—is rather difficult to draw. It might be argued, indeed, that Rousseau's formulae owe their fame as much to the Revolution as the Revolution owed its direction to them; and it is certain that the world would have heard less of them if they had not been applied in so spectacular a fashion. Perhaps the chief proof of their vitality lies in the fact that the practical application of them did not begin until men had had five-and-twenty years in which to turn them over in their minds. To that extent, they unquestionably stood the test of time; and the question remains whether they have also stood the test of application, whether they are still vital now that we have learnt what they mean in practice. On the whole it must be conceded that they have stood that test, and, whether true or false, are still vital.

One says 'on the whole' for two reasons: partly because the formal and direct appeal to Rousseau has very largely ceased; partly because even the original disciples only took from their master that portion of his Gospel which it suited their purposes to take. One can find Socialism in the Gospel according to Rousseau; but the Revolutionists were individualists, and modern Collectivism appears to be derived from quite other philosophic sources. In that department of political philosophy he is ignored; and perhaps in all departments discussion of his so-called 'sophisms' is nowadays an academic exercise only interesting to an academic public. It is impossible to picture Mr. Mann or Mr. Tillett or Mr. Gosling, or even King Pataud, expounding him to an enthusiastic audience in a public thoroughfare. But his writings are nevertheless vital in this sense: that they embody a principle which was new when he propounded it, and of which the world, having once laid hold of it, will not willingly let go.

That principle is, of course, the essential equality of men, the essential artificiality of those differences between them upon which the 'privileges' of 'privileged classes' are based. There are many senses, of course, in which the statement that all men are equal is admitted by all men, unconsciously if not openly, to be absurd. The majority of men, however, feel that to cite instances of that inequality in reply to Rousseau's proposition is merely to trifle with words: that there is no

natural inequality among men which entitles one class of men to keep other classes of men in social, political, or industrial subjection. That view of equality first laid hold of mankind when Rousseau put it in a book. In spite of reaction provoked by excesses, it has gained ground ever since. It was, alternately with nationalism, the insurgent emotion which so soon shook the apparently irresistible power of the Holy Alliance ; and, in spite of the many cross-currents in the complicated stream of tendency, we can still trace its influence even in countries which boast of having achieved the results of revolution by gradual and orderly development. It explains how the knees of Tories tremble at the suggestion that they should 'go to the 'country with the House of Lords on their back.' It may also explain—though it is not in the least likely to be invoked as the explanation—a good deal of the instinctive hostility of labouring men towards Mr. Lloyd George's ingenious and complicated schemes for ear-marking the 'employed' as persons who may, at any stage of their lives, be called upon to give a full account of their comings and goings to the class of 'employers,' and so re-building privilege upon an illusory basis of socialistic philanthropy.

FRANCIS GRIBBLE.

CHAUVINISM IN MUSIC

1. **Style in Musical Art.** By C. Hubert Parry, Bart., Mus.Doc. Macmillan and Co. 1912.
2. **Music and Nationalism.** By Cecil Forsyth. Macmillan and Co. 1911.
3. **Critical and Historical Essays (in Music).** By Edward MacDowell, late Professor of Music in Columbia University. New York: Arthur P. Schmidt.
4. **Der Stil in der Musik.** By Dr. Guido Adler, Professor of Musical Science in the University of Vienna. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. 1911.

IT may be confidently asserted that the chief pre-occupation of our current musical literature is the foundation of a school of national music in this country. In almost every recent publication dealing with contemporary music we find ourselves confronted with some aspect of the question. The columns of the press devoted to the reports of our multitudinous concerts ring with the cuckoo-cries of 'native idiom' and 'a national school.' This passionate desire to advocate the claims of British music is in itself legitimate and laudable; but some who love the art in all its manifestations, and have not lost all critical discrimination in frenzied Chauvinism, may object to many of the methods used to forward the ends in view. It is certain that the propaganda shows itself too frequently in a somewhat unworthy disparagement of good work which comes to us from outside; in extravagant laudation of the compositions of one or two British composers; in clamorous demands that musical *entrepreneurs* should more frequently feed our public—which through a long habit of generous eclecticism has become more intelligent than is generally supposed—upon the unripe fruits of our budding talents; and finally in continual admonitions which can be by no means helpful to the young musicians to whom they are addressed.

With some of our writers for the press the theme of native music now looms so large in comparison with the art of music itself that they are in danger of taking the part for the whole, and this is giving a good deal of our criticism a regrettable narrowness of view and a carping tone towards much admirable endeavour which has not for its primary object the exploitation of British music. Loud are the complaints that native work

is neglected in our concert-rooms, and still more in our homes ; yet when a novelty of British manufacture is produced the criticism it evokes—unless it emanates from a composer of established reputation—is often of a very perfunctory kind, and fails entirely to help the public to form any sound criteria as to the national music about which they are expected to show increasing enthusiasm.

This is discouraging, both to those who have risked the inclusion of unknown works at their concerts, and to the young composer who might be glad to feel the pulse of the public through the judgments of the press. Strange, too, and disconcerting, is the lack of unanimity, and even of individual consistency, as to where we actually stand in regard to our national music. Sometimes we find our contemporary critics extolling the British school as an accomplished fact, a national glory, and almost before the column ends the foreign tendencies of our composers are deplored, and the article closes in a touching peroration wherein they are entreated to create works of ' a national significance ' and to employ a ' native idiom ' for the expression of their ideas. This advice to *strive* for nationalism arouses mistrust. If we really had a British school and a native idiom there would be no need for conscious effort in these directions.

All this mass of injudicious journalism is worse for the public than for the composers. The views of the former might, to some extent, be directed by well-balanced and penetrating criticism of what is being done in our midst ; the latter, those at least who have a sturdy individuality—and the rest will never count—are probably very little swayed by it in their actual method of composition. The American critic, Mr. Horatio Parker, discerns the futility of most criticism to advance, divert, or arrest the movement of the creative impulse :

' It is consoling (he writes) to think that all the words written and spoken about art have never yet influenced creative artists to any great extent. Their inspiration must come from within, and, after the preliminary technical progress over the well-trod paths of their artistic forefathers, which progress no great artist has ever yet evaded or avoided, their further advancement is always by empirical and not by logical processes ; for logic in art, although very real, is not reducible to words until after it has become an accomplished fact through empirical or instinctive practice.'

This is sound common sense, and we may safely leave the composer who really has something to say to find out his own way of saying it. But the critical energy, which is largely wasted in worshipping one artist and advising another, might be very helpfully employed in laying before the public some clearer and more definite conclusions as to where we actually are moving, and where we can move, in the matter of a national school of music.

The English public are frequently blamed for their lack of patriotic feeling as regards music. They are told that they ought to take more interest in the works produced by their own musicians, especially those which have as a basis our long neglected treasures of folk-song which have been, and are being, resuscitated with miraculous and suspicious rapidity in every corner of the kingdom. We must, however, take the English public as it exists, without, for the moment, enquiring too closely into the causes of the perverseness and naughtiness which have given us, in the words of Sir Hubert Parry, ' a great ' and indomitable taste for the music of other nations.' One thing is certain : it is so long since any section of our society has been nourished on the folk-song diet that out of an average concert-going public in this country it may be safely predicted that hardly one person in every fifty could sing, or recognise if heard, more than about ten of those once popular songs ; and those recalled to memory would be of the ballad class, such as ' The Bailiff's Daughter of Islington ' or ' Robin Adair,' which are not folk-songs in the strict sense of the word. The other kind of folk-song—the local or parochial ditty which is the object of pious cult among a certain section of musical England—is practically unknown to the public, and judging from much of the gentle twaddle sung to and by our children at the competition musical festivals, the loss is not greatly to be deplored. For good or ill, the elder people who frequent concerts in England have been brought up on Handel, the German classics, and a proportion of Italian operatic music ; while the younger generation have imbibed Wagner, Tchaikovsky, Richard Strauss and Debussy. The child that has tasted meat will refuse to return to pap. A public that will gladly go to hear a Beethoven or a Wagner programme has reached a stage of musical development whence it is never likely to step backward and occupy itself seriously with the

folk-music it has comfortably dispensed with for nearly two centuries. I am speaking of that comparatively small section of the British public which concerns itself in any way with the public performance of music ; the only public in fact to which our more serious composers can address themselves. The man in the street prefers musical comedy to resuscitated folk-song ; and both sections of society have but a confused idea of the meaning of the words, so glibly employed by certain musical writers at the present moment : such as ' native idiom ' and ' national school.'

This mental confusion springs to a great extent from the vague and insincere way in which the more ardent propagandists of native art present the tenets which they are in such hot haste to spread. The factors which seem contributory to this false presentation are first, the idea of protection, which is so much in the air that it has for the time being infected even our views on artistic questions ; and secondly, a mistaken notion of what really constitutes a ' native idiom.' Added to this, there is so keen an ambition to prove that we are in actual possession of a national school and a native idiom that the most fanatical disciples of this movement forget to enquire whether these are really the highest things to be striven after in music ; or whether, indeed, a nation like ours which has been so long steeped in cosmopolitan culture can be ever again sincerely content with insular art.

The aim of this article is to protest against the exaggerated reaction against that foreign element which is still in some measure necessary to our musical life ; to attempt a distinction between a native idiom and a representative national style ; to show that those countries which still possess the most exclusively national idiom are nearly all in process of exchanging it for a more universal musical language ; and finally, if space permits, to point out that the possession of a native idiom and a state-supported opera does not invariably lead to a musical millennium in which every national composer has a chance of having his works performed to a patriotic and expectant public.

Evidences of this narrowly protective spirit in our musical life might be dismissed as a mere fleeting phase of irritability—the pricking of a newly awakened circulation in our benumbed musical faculties—if they only appeared in our ephemeral

journalistic literature. But they are more seriously to be noted and regretted when we find them re-echoed and emphasised in books of a carefully planned nature, intended to appeal more deeply and permanently to the sentiments of the nation.

In Mr. Cecil Forsyth's book on 'Music and Nationalism' we have an example of the patriotic spirit run wild and pushed to unprofitable extremes. The principal title of the book leads us to expect a general and comparative enquiry into the popular music of various countries; but its sub-title, 'A Study 'of English Opera,' more accurately describes the scope of the work. The author makes a praiseworthy effort to co-ordinate our musical history with that of our national activities, social and political, but restricts his review of our musical development almost entirely to the sphere of opera. As a result of his enquiry he discovers that the working of the musical and national mind in this country differs chiefly in continuity.

'A distinct connectedness of effort (he says) may be traced in the gradual, slow process by which we have built up a complex and varying system of colonial and Asiatic administration . . . in the evolution of our naval methods . . . in our language and its forms as developed by our poets and prose writers . . . In English music, and especially in English opera, we can find no trace of this "connectedness of thought."'

Mr. Forsyth, believing that no one nation is more, or less, musically gifted than another, then proceeds to evolve a new theory to account for the long period of comparative unproductiveness which has lasted since the beginning of the fifteenth century, when we were incontestably in advance of other European nations. Discarding a reason commonly put forward to cover the reproach of our musical indolence, namely the fact that the English have been too busy doing other things, the author of 'Music and Nationalism' attributes our musical sterility to our steadily increasing 'over-seas energy.' This, he admits, has been no hindrance to our development in other directions—in statecraft, literature and painting; but music, he argues, is created under totally different conditions from the other arts and needs to be fostered in a more quiescent atmosphere. It is not the energy which a country expends upon the advancement of commerce and science, or in religious and political struggles, which necessarily exhausts its musical

faculties, says Mr. Forsyth, but this tendency towards ' national ' projection.' As examples of what he calls the ' interiorising ' and ' exteriorising ' national types he points on the one hand to Germany (down to the close of the nineteenth century) and on the other to Rome and England. The former presents a picture ' of contentment, of peaceful contemplation and ' reflection, of leisure and concentration ' ; the latter ' of ' (necessary) discontent, of nervous anxiety, of continual ' motion and expansion.' Both these pictures seem a little over-coloured to suit the exigencies of Mr. Forsyth's theory. Hölderlin, writing about the last decade of the seventeenth century, thus describes the atmosphere of ' contentment and ' peaceful contemplation ' which enwrapped the superior minds of his day. The Germans, he says in his ' Hyperion,' have been barbarians from time immemorial, and industry, science, even religion itself, have only made them still more barbarous, incapable of every divine feeling, too utterly depraved to enjoy the happiness conferred by the Graces. Writing of the poets and artists of this ' interiorising ' land, he says : ' They live in ' the world like strangers in their own house . . . they grow ' up full of love and life and hope, and twenty years later one ' sees them wandering about like shadows, silent and cold.' Does not this sound an echo of the complaint of our contemporary musicians amid the ' exteriorisation ' of Great Britain ? Before leaving this point in Mr. Forsyth's argument we may be permitted to express a doubt whether ' discontent ' and nervous anxiety ' were in reality characteristic features of the ' bold buccaneering ' Elizabethan age ; while at the same time we may recall the fact that at this time, which was one of the starting-points of our great and rapid extension, we were not devoid of a school of music which, as Sir Hubert Parry says, had ' a national and consistent flavour,' although its charm and ' unaffected tunefulness ' were not supported by the necessary vigour and passion to make it fully and lastingly representative. Later on came one musical genius of outstanding nobility, Henry Purcell, but even after his coming our musical vitality seemed unequal to the task of building up a great and unified school of national music.

It must not be forgotten that music is not the only one of our arts which has passed through such sharp vicissitudes of inactivity and poverty of inspiration that they have seemed

at times in danger of total extinction. Sculpture and architecture, arts which are dependent upon external stimulus, and therefore unaffected, according to Mr. Forsyth's theory, by the growth of world-power, have had their periods of weakness and denationalisation. No one has as yet constructed an elaborate philosophy to explain why at a time when our literature and painting were evoking the admiration of other countries, our national buildings and monuments attested to an extreme prostration of creative power. Yet to the vision of common sense the cases of Christopher Wren, of Flaxman, and of Purcell as isolated artistic phenomena all seem much on a par. Whether, in truth, the blame for our lack of constructive vitality in musical art can be fairly laid at the door of our impulse towards constant extension will still be open to doubt, even after a close consideration of Mr. Forsyth's ingenious arguments. There seems but one reason for the periodical apparition and dwindling of the creative impulse in all forms of art, and that reason is as inexplicable as the advent and the passing of life itself. The divine fire, like the lightning, smites now in one place, now in another, irrespective of external conditions; but the divine fire of the creative spirit is a swift illuminating light, not a devastating flame. After much discussion of his theory Mr. Forsyth draws a conclusion which is somewhat evasive:

> 'We must not suppose that the mere absence of the national outstretching towards world-power is sufficient to make the production of music a certainty. Its presence so to speak always sterilises, though its absence does not necessarily fertilise, the musical faculty. It is not the mere holding in fee of so many square miles of territory, or the subjection of so many million aliens, but the national grasping outwards in the direction of these objects which constitutes the bar to musical progress.'

If Mr. Forsyth could promise the possession of musical capacity as a compensation for the loss of world-empire, little Englanders might have a new weapon in their array of arguments; but he distinctly warns us that we might lose a temporal world without gaining a musical soul.

Nevertheless the author of 'Music and Nationalism' is not without hope for the future. When our empire reaches a point at which expansion is no longer possible—in other words, when we arrive at that stage of arrested progress which history

teaches us invariably precedes the decadence of a great world-power—he foresees ' musical results on a scale of strange-' ness and immensity hitherto unknown.' This promise of a musical strangeness, stranger than anything that the world has endured as yet, is not altogether alluring. But once again, Mr. Forsyth beats a partial retreat before the temerity of his own pronouncements, for he adds ' though it may be possible ' for the nation to come to some such period of mental con-' tentment and concentration as far as its white empire is ' concerned, such a state of mind seems fundamentally ' impossible as long as the anxieties involved in its domination ' over alien races remain.' India, then, and South Africa must be the price of a ' nest sufficiently warm and well protected ' for the laying of the musical eggs.' We firmly believe that the majority of Englishmen in their unregenerate aesthetic state would prefer as an alternative that these symphonic and operatic ' eggs ' should be addled and chilled. Such, alas, is the brutality of the larger patriotism ! Henri IV. thought France well worth a mass ; it is very doubtful whether, even in Handel's day, the English would have sacrificed Sark for an oratorio ; still less can we bring ourselves to believe that we could ever regard a national opera house as a *quid pro quo* for our Indian empire. If national opera waits upon the decadence of empire—long may its advent be deferred !

So far Mr. Forsyth's theory, though open to question, is not open to serious censure. Unhappily the later chapters of an interesting book offer too many examples of another phase of our insincere attitude towards nationality in music. Having found in England's political ' exteriorisation ' an ingenious, if not entirely sound, reason for our musical poverty of blood, he is not content with this vindication of our backward position in comparison with other nations, but must, during the remainder of his book, attack the harmless necessary foreigner imported into our midst.

It seems to anger Mr. Forsyth quite unreasonably that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, after we had had our Purcell and failed to take advantage of his example, although ' at his death the position was full of possibilities ' for the English people,' our aristocracy, ' the richest and ' most travelled in Europe,' set up an Italian opera in England. Their sin was not that they imported a rival element into a

country that was striving to build up a musical system of its own, but that they brought an art which was in vogue in every civilised capital in Europe to a country which, on Mr. Forsyth's showing, had paralysed its own musical productivity with the poisonous fumes of world-ambition.

There was surely much to gain in having a centre of what was then modern music, even an alien centre, in our capital. Nor is it by any means certain that the action of our aristocracy did anything to retard the establishment of native opera in England. The cult of the Italian opera preceded the national movement in Germany, France, Russia and Sweden, and, as soon as the popular consciousness awoke to its needs, home-made opera grew out of the widespread demand for dramatic music to be sung in the vernacular. Italian opera, translated opera, hybrid opera and finally national opera—this describes the process of evolution in every country in which that form of art has taken root. In Germany, France and Russia, the various phases of development have been rapid and decisive; in England and Sweden more languid and fluctuating, probably because in these lands opera has not so far exercised the same attraction for the masses as in the three countries first named.

But Mr. Forsyth, moved to righteous indignation that our aristocracy should bring opera ready-made to England, where secular music was almost wholly neglected, tells us that what they really imported from the Continent was 'a cosmopolitan 'veneer and a species of intellectual snobbery which was the 'deforming characteristic of their mixed breed.' Is this a new argument in favour of the abolition of the House of Lords, or is it merely playing to the gallery—to that very small gallery moreover which is almost exclusively made up of the musical profession itself?

It is the grievance of the British musician that the foreigner has supplied a want which has, until quite recently, been a very pressing one in this country, and that he shows no disposition to take our musical goods in return. A close and unbiased examination of the question would I believe prove beyond doubt that, but for the long fostering of the art in this country by foreigners, the English musical profession would be a much smaller and less active body than it is now. The rigid exclusiveness of continental nations in regard to their

respective musical elements is grossly exaggerated in statements to the effect that the French nation 'having endowed Paris 'with a soul' will not permit her to be the 'howling ground of 'the Goth, the Saxon and the Teuton.' Even as I write, Paris is preparing herself to be not the 'howling ground,' let us hope, but the meeting-place of representative international choirs including a large contingent of English singers. Our native musicians, creative and executive, are being courteously, and even enthusiastically, received abroad, although the assistance of the latter class has not been a necessity to continental countries, in which musical education has been developed to more practical ends than in England. The rank and file of English orchestral players, for instance, are slowly coming to realise their one weakness as compared with foreign players. Their technical skill is frequently as good as or better than that of the foreigner, but their opportunities of gaining experience and a repertory are fewer. The public, who know nothing about the expense of frequent rehearsals, hardly realise the immense value of this practical experience in the continental artist. We are still gradually learning from other nations, and we need not be in an unseemly hurry to kick down the ladder by which we have climbed half-way to musical eminence. Consider the marked increase in our chances of hearing fine orchestral concerts in this country, which, as Sir Hubert Parry points out, has been 'such a striking 'feature in the past quarter of a century and has given a great 'number of people of a higher grade than those who confine 'their musical experiences to music halls and comic operas 'an opportunity for quickening their musical intelligence.' Could this orchestral movement have been started five-and-twenty years ago, and brought to such perfection, without any extraneous assistance? Indubitably not. Even the later phases of this movement received an immense impulse from the visits of famous foreign conductors with their highly trained permanent orchestras; for such of our native musicians who were wise enough, and receptive enough, to learn instead of protesting, reaped a rich harvest of experience. Let us therefore generously acknowledge our debt to the foreigners, and refrain from joining Mr. Forsyth in outbursts of Chauvinistic rhetoric such as this:

'How long will it be before we realise the fact that where the

foreign musician is there is the enemy. He may come to this island in shoals, but he comes for one purpose only, the money he can take back across the water, and well he knows that the surest way to make his position firm here is to denationalise our music.'

We have needed the foreign element in the past, when its chief service to England was to keep even a small section of society in mind of much that was noble and progressive in secular music, in which we had—either from the apathy bred of world-ambition or from lack of the divine fire—dropped far behind the standard of other nations. The only crime of the foreigner at that time was the denationalisation of the non-existent. We need the foreign element in the present for two reasons: first, because even a quarter of a century of enthusiastic, but none too practical, musical education has hardly yet sufficed to place us on a working level with some continental nations; and, secondly, because the English people, whose capacities for appreciation are still in advance of their creative gifts, have an incurable desire to welcome the best examples of all the arts to this country. As regards the future, we shall probably need a foreign market when the day comes in which we shall produce music on a scale 'of strangeness 'and immensity hitherto unknown.' Human nature being what it is, our composers, even now, are as pleased to have their works produced by the 'enemy' as foreign composers are to have their creations applauded in London; and when our musical millennium has come, it is not likely that the ambition of our composers for world-fame will have diminished in the same ratio as our appetite for world-power.

One more quotation from Mr. Forsyth's 'Music and Nation-'alism': 'Every lover of English opera should, therefore, 'fix firmly in his mind the hope that the pernicious cult of 'the foreigner, which makes London the (very profitable) 'laughing-stock of Europe, should be ended.' Writing from a fairly wide experience of foreign musicians in their own lands, I hasten to affirm, with a patriotism as sincere as Mr. Forsyth's, that London is not the laughing-stock of the musical foreigner. A very real interest in, and sympathy with, our nascent musical activity is felt abroad, as many of our composers and executants could tell if they chose; while as regards our standards of performance, I have heard more generous and discriminating tributes of praise from foreigners than from Englishmen.

What might, indeed, make London the laughing-stock of the Continent would be—were they read abroad—the utterance of such crudely hostile sentiments; or, still worse, the strange retaliatory policy of the British branch of the International Musical Society, who during the festival week held in London last season saw fit to produce nothing but the music of our own countrymen: a proceeding so at variance with English traditions of courteous hospitality that it can only be compared to asking guests to dinner, setting before them nothing but local dishes, and boring them with an endless conversation about the merits of our own cooks. It is not by such methods as these that we shall help to establish, or preserve, in our midst a school of national music; for, to be worthy of the name, such a school must reflect all our noblest and sincerest qualities rather than our pettiest and most insular defects.

Just as injurious to musical progress in our own country as the phase of Chauvinism illustrated in many pages of Mr. Forsyth's book is the prevalence of mistaken notions as to what really constitutes a 'native idiom.'

We sometimes see a disposition to consider nationality in music as no longer existent, and to speak of it as a sentiment dead and cremated in the flames of an ever-advancing and ever-mingling international culture. This is an extreme point of view. Difficult as the psychology of European nations may be to follow and expound, on account of the social complexities of highly civilised life, yet contact with the men and the literatures of divers countries cannot fail to leave us with some more or less clear impression of their respective characteristics. 'Natural character,' says Fouillée in his 'Esquisse psycholo-'gique des Peuples européens,' 'is allied to temperament and 'constitution, which are themselves closely connected with 'race and physical environment. It is quite possible to say 'in general terms what are the leading characteristics of the 'Germanic, the Slavonic, the Celtic, and Iberian races.' To the difficulty which besets the student of national psychology brought up against the fact that races change in the course of time, Fouillée opposes the view that even when allowance is made for historical development the basis remains much the same, because it belongs to temperament and hereditary cerebral constitution.

If we admit—as most of us do—the continued existence of

nationality in music, we must allow that it shows itself in two forms, the one exclusive, the other more general. First we have the *native idiom*, or folk-music, of a nation which is to a great extent a limited expression of the idiosyncrasies and geographical surroundings of a particular country; and secondly we have *national style* which is the outcome of a longer and more blended culture; more complex, less naïve in its self-revelation, but still presenting a clearly recognisable reflection of the soul of a particular race.

The native idiom belongs to a country's youth, to an æsthetically unsophisticated period of its development, and the length and primitive purity of its existence depend greatly upon that country's comparative isolation from external influences. It is not, of course, the earliest manifestation of musical expression, for it has already grown out of the naked chant of the savage, and has assumed design as a garment, and added the distinctive mannerisms which make it recognisable as national. 'Folk-music,' says the American composer Edward MacDowell, borrowing a simile from Taine, 'may be likened 'to a twig which has fallen into a salt-mine. Every year 'adds fresh jewels to the crystals that form on it until at last 'the only resemblance to the original (the barbaric strain) is 'in the general contour.' Native idiom is something already extraneous to the essential principle of folk-music. Take a Russian, Scotch or Tartar air and divest it of the peculiarities which impart its peculiar national flavour, and it becomes melody pure and simple—the unadulterated fluid material of music, shedding completely its outward adornments of nationality. Harmony, that later adjunct to music, which MacDowell aptly describes as 'the shadow-language' of melody, just as gesture is the shadow-language of speech—harmony can so transmute the folk-melody of one country that it can masquerade as the product of another. The folk-song (the native idiom) is therefore a kind of connecting phase between barbaric music and music in its ultimate free and complex development, divested of the swaddling bands of national mannerism.

MacDowell, while deprecating the futile attempts of certain Americans to evolve a school of national music out of Indian and spurious negro folk-melodies, was himself a profound student of folk-music. He saw clearly enough that a recognisable

national idiom does not exist as an essential part of music, but as the outcome of certain characteristic turns of thought and tricks of expression, which may sometimes be indigenous and sometimes caught from an alien race. 'The 'figure on which this garment of nationalism has been placed,' he writes, 'is much the same the world over, and its relationship 'to the universal language of savage music is very marked. 'Carmen's song, divested of the mixture of triplets and dual 'rhythms (Spanish or Moorish), is akin to the howl' (the descending scale of undefined intervals which MacDowell holds to be one of the three invariable elements of barbaric music).

The true native idiom, therefore, we may take to be the folk-song of a particular nation with its incrustation of special mannerisms, such as ornamentation, rhythm, reiteration and such scale characteristics as the use of the augmented second and the diminished third. The purest type of folk-song is often the one most difficult to docket with its national label, for its vital element lies in its direct, intimate appeal to the emotions; in its naïve, unconscious universality. In most folk-music the trappings of nationality cling closely to it only so long as the country of its birth remains isolated from alien influences. That is why we find that the peasantry in remote districts are the true reliquary of the folk-song which languishes in the vicinity of the large urban centres. The bulk of the proletariat, the industrial workers, soon drop the folk-song. Its references to rural life, to games and dances in wide green meadows, to spring sowings and autumn harvests, very soon lose all true meaning for the city workers. Folk-music is by no means such a deeply-rooted need of human nature as national sentimentalists would have us believe. It is rapidly contaminated and tossed aside by those who bring it in contact with the baser forms of civilisation. To prove this we need only compare the variants of an individual song as sung by the peasants in the depths of the country, or by the townsfolk of a few years standing. First the words and then the music undergo such complete changes that the soul of the song is no longer the same. Even in the country the process of modification has set in. In Russia, for example, the importation of quantities of cheap concertinas, which ring the changes continuously on the chords of tonic and dominant, has sufficed to make a considerable change in the folk-singing in some

districts. When this process of deterioration has been going on, as it has been with us, for centuries, enthusiasts may save a few of these already decayed folk-songs from complete extinction, but they will no more be able to build up a school of national music on these relics than they could reclothe rural England out of the scraps of smock-frocks and kirtles which may linger in farmhouse cupboards and ragbags in the more out-of-the-way corners of the kingdom.

In lands which from historical or geographical reasons have remained segregated from alien civilisations the folk-song may still be found in its most typical aspect, with all its unchastened mannerisms ; and the peasantry are its priesthood. A composer born in one of these happy or unhappy countries will be in possession from the outset of his career of a characteristic native idiom. If he be brought up in rural surroundings he imbibes this idiom as he does the particular sounds of nature around him. It is a gift unsought for and unescapable. He makes no conscious effort to retain or reject it, but simply takes it for granted like the first accents of his mother-tongue. But it is noticeable that, perhaps because of this unconscious assimilation, he rarely begins by making his national music the raw material of his art. He learns his technique in quite a different school and often a little time elapses before he understands how to blend the popular language with the extraneous elements acquired from the study of great classical models. Glinka's first attempts at composition were more Italian than Russian ; Grieg's Opus I. was a set of pianoforte variations on a *German* air—and instances of the kind might be easily multiplied. The next step towards national expression will be taken more consciously, but quite naturally, for his stock of folk-material is within himself, and by and by he uses his native idiom with force and eloquence, ennobling its provincialisms, as it were, and enlarging its limitations until it becomes capable of uttering thoughts and emotions which lie far beyond its primitive scope. It is true that the characteristic mannerisms of his raw material, be it Russian, Finnish or Spanish, cannot always remain his exclusive property. They may be copied by any foreign composer who chooses to do so ; but the foreigner can only partly identify himself with his adopted idiom, and however skilfully he may turn it to his own uses, he will never feel exactly as a Russian, a Finn

or a Spaniard would feel in handling his own dialect. But in countries where there has been frequent interchange of intellectual and musical ideas with neighbouring nations, and a longer cultivation of the art of polyphony, the peculiarities of the folk-material—and even the material itself—tend to become obliterated. Dr. Guido Adler points out, in his recently published volume 'Der Stil in der Musik,' how in the course of history, musical groups are formed which all attain to an equal degree of cultivation by following the highroad of polyphony without any special or definite relation to the national movement. Again, not all the primitive musical characteristics of a race will be accepted and elaborated in their art-music; many will go to make way for the idiosyncrasies of other lands. No nation has beaten its way more completely than ourselves through the shifting winds and currents of international influences. We must accept that fact together with its undeniable advantages, and confess that to attempt to build up a school of national music on a half-spurious or artificially resuscitated folk-song would be indeed to build upon the sands.

In his book on 'Style in Musical Art' Sir Hubert Parry devotes only one chapter to 'National Influences.' In those few pages, however, he shows a complete and scholarly apprehension of the fact that international action and reaction are as inevitable in music as in other expressions of national temperament. He warns us that 'it is wise to remember that 'when talking of French, or German or Italian music we 'are speaking of the music of very mixed races.' He might with truth have added England to the list of those western nations of decidedly composite elements. He sees, too, with the untroubled vision of the historian, such phenomena as 'the 'Teutons of the eighteenth century being entirely submerged 'by Italian opera,' or the underlying principles of the finest chamber music owing their existence to the perseverance of the Italians in 'hammering out the types of the essentially 'classical forms'; or Beethoven starting to work upon an Italian foundation. In fact, Sir Hubert Parry shows us how each nation has learnt, and may perhaps learn again, from another. The Germans learnt from the Italians, and the Italians are now learning their art anew from the Germans.

To these examples we may add those of the older nations learning from the later comers in the musical field. The

recent cult of Tchaikovsky's music in this country may have been over-emphasised, but side by side with much imitation of his mannerisms it left us with a distinctly emotional gain, our younger composers losing under his influence some of the Englishman's self-conscious horror of ' giving himself away ' ; while familiarity with the Russian school in general has imparted immense style and brilliance to our orchestration during the last ten years. Sir Hubert Parry, while keeping a perfectly balanced judgment as to the international influences of the past, sounds a note of alarm when it comes to the influences of the present. When he speaks of the dangers of imitating the composers of races ' hardly raised above ' savagery ' we feel that he is laying too much stress upon the barbaric conditions of the Slav races. This is always the case when we try to judge an entire civilisation from one manifestation of it. A deeper knowledge of the literature and social life of these countries makes us less prone to attribute everything that strikes us as strange in their music to barbarism. Strangely enough he draws many of his illustrations from the works of the much-travelled and cosmopolitan Tchaikovsky, whose musical education was largely German and wholly academic, and who till the end of his life never quite shook off the influence of the Italian operatic style, with which he was more familiar in youth than with the folk-music of his own country.

Throughout his book Sir Hubert Parry draws a curious line of demarcation between Czechs and Slavs, thereby arbitrarily depriving the former of their racial birthright. It is easily understood that he is seeking for some term which conveniently differentiates the Eastern from the Western Slav—the Pole from the Russian or the Bulgarian from the Bohemian. The difference is not so great in sentiment and in language as it is commonly assumed to be ; and in any case we cannot thus divide the nations in their common origin. Moreover, unless the observation is intended only to apply to the order in which these composers became known in England, he is hardly correct in asserting that ' Smetana and Dvořák led the way and the ' Slav composers followed by a natural sequence.' The Russian school of music is of older date than the Bohemian, especially if we take into consideration the long line of secondary composers who led up to Glinka, and weigh the artistic restraint

and the finish manifest in the works of this musician as compared with some of the earliest essays of Smetana, or even Dvořák.

But these criticisms may seem to be the mere quibbles of a specialist. In spite of some chronological exaggeration, the following quotation dealing with the enjoyment and assimilation of alien music contains much wisdom :

'There are many aspects to this question. It is quite right that civilised people should extend the sphere of their imaginative sympathies. To be reminded through music of the types of humanity which we have left behind some thousands of years ago is refreshing. It gives the welcome sense of being free for a little while from the incubus of over-elaborated civilisation ; of reaching out a hand to primitive types of our own species. Within such a range the western composer might possibly draw fresh nutriment from the poetic art of the Slavs and Czechs.'

Elsewhere he adds :

'Their influence is already apparent in the increasing fervour and vehemence and high colouring of latter-day art. But the more reticent and self-controlled races can only safely adopt the style and material of semi-developed and partially oriental races with critical circumspection.'

There seems to be no doubt that during the last quarter of a century we have shown ourselves in many aspects of social life as being emotional, sentimental, and even hysterical, in a degree which completely contradicts our ancient reputation for cool-headedness, phlegm, and self-control. A warning to avoid in our music the riotous excess of colour and the violent emotionalism of some of the Slav composers is fully justified. But it is not in these particulars alone that we should do well to avoid the imitation of the younger schools of music in Europe. The real danger lies in the temptation to copy them by trying to found a school on the basis of an exclusive nationalism without having their justification of a still warm and living folk-idiom at our command. Mr. Runciman, in the *Saturday Review*, once wrote words in this connexion which are worth all the reiterated clamourings for 'a native 'idiom' and 'a national school' that have ever yet wasted good ink and paper. He said :

'Is not this desire of our composers to be "national" and "English" a craze and obsession? It seems to me not at all an

instinct, for instinct works blindly, without self-consciousness and without regard to consequences. It is an obsession, the obsession of a waste and derelict tradition from the days when each nation, in actual being, or in the making, regarded itself as an entity cut off by divine ordinance from the rest of mankind.'

It is difficult to imagine Bach—at once the most national and the most universal of musical poets—pausing amid his busy life in Cöthen or Leipzig to enquire of himself day by day : ' Am I German ? Do I write works of national significance ? ' If not, why not ? Is it the pernicious influence of that ' Dutchman, Sweelinck ? ' We prefer to think of him untroubled because sure of his nationality, working with serene concentration, and sustained by the best of all convictions : that individuality—the essential quality in music—stands alone.

It might be profitable for our most ardent and indiscriminate propagandists of nationalism to look into the histories of those countries where an exclusive patriotism has attempted to feed upon itself. The later Russian school of music has sprung up almost within the memory of many of us and affords an example of the virtues and vices of too close an adherence to the national ideal.

Russia started with a state-aided opera-house—such as is so often advocated as a panacea for all the ills of our composers —in both her capitals. But the state, like the private *entrepreneur*, did not care to be out of pocket by its ventures. All through the nineteenth century the Russian taste for Italian opera was as pronounced as our own, and long after national operas had been written and proffered for production, the intendants of the Imperial opera-houses gave the preference to the foreign works that drew the aristocratic subscriber and brought most money to the till. Glinka, after the great success of his first opera, ' A Life for the Tsar,' failed utterly to please this public—the official world of music—with his equally national and more mature work ' Russlau and Lioud- ' milla.' As a consequence of this failure, he abandoned further operatic projects and practically went into voluntary exile. Dargomijsky waited years without receiving from the operatic authorities any definite reply respecting his second opera ; he did not even know whether his work was still lying among other neglected manuscripts in the archives of the

opera-house, or whether it had been destroyed by some careless underling. His best work was never given in his lifetime. Moussorgsky suffered many indignities and rejections on account of the realistic treatment of his historical operas. Borodin's beautiful epic music drama 'Prince Igor' owed all its early productions to private enterprise. All this was disheartening to the representatives of nationalism in music, and it is no wonder that they stood shoulder to shoulder to hold their own against cosmopolitanism and the many intrigues and injustices which go to make up the moral atmosphere of a state-supported theatre. At length, by force of loud clamouring and hard-hitting on the part of their literary champions, the 'Invincible Band'—as they were dubbed by their opponents—won their way to the front. The 'material necessities' for which Mr. Forsyth makes a strong appeal at the close of his book were indeed forthcoming. More than one rich patron came forward to help the cause of national music. But he who pays the piper will, directly or indirectly, call the tune. If he be a Mæcenas of wide culture and liberal tastes he will perhaps call a variety of tunes; if, on the other hand, he be a home-keeping millionaire with a narrowly patriotic outlook he will call only for tunes that awaken a familiar echo in his heart. So an edict—maybe an unspoken one—goes forth that a composer who expects his patronage must always write in the 'native idiom'; which is equivalent to laying down a law that a painter's pictures will be disqualified for exhibition if he uses more colours on his palette than those which appear in his country's flag. Something of this kind occurred to the ultra-national school of music in Russia, and was realised by some of its most fervent supporters as time went on. It is not difficult to trace signs of fatigue and perfunctoriness in the later works of its representatives. At times the burden of nationality seems to hang heavy on their shoulders; the perpetual burning of incense to one ideal dulled the alertness of their artistic sensibilities. Less grew out of that splendid outburst of patriotic feeling in the 'sixties than those who hailed its first manifestations had reason to anticipate. Its bases were probably too narrowly exclusive to support an edifice of truly imposing dimensions. Gradually the inevitable has happened. The younger men threw off the restrictions of the folk-song school, and sought new

ideas from the French symbolists or the realism of Richard Strauss. There is very little native idiom, although there are still distinctive features of the national style, in the work of such latter-day composers as Scriabin, Tcherepnin and Medtner. The physiognomy of Russian music is changing day by day, and although it is full of interest, one would welcome a development on larger and more independent lines.

The schools which still cling most persistently and closely to the use of the native idiom are those which constitute the Scandinavian group, and although they are doing a great deal of sane and pleasant work, it cannot be said that there is any composer of outstanding merit in Sweden and Denmark at the present moment; while in Norway, Grieg has found as yet no successor.

Only in the Finnish school, the latest comer in the world of music, which is in some measure a link between Scandinavian and Slavonic music, can we discern a musical star of greater magnitude. The Danes, the Swedes and Norwegians express themselves chiefly in their respective dialects; but the Finns already show in the changes of style noticeable in the music of their leader, Jean Sibelius, a tendency to a less exclusive and naïve reiteration of national sentiments. Comparing the later with the earlier works of this complex and interesting composer, we note a tendency to increased subjectivity; to the substitution of personal utterance—always delicately restrained—for the more epic and pictorial art of his early symphonic works, which were based on episodes from the Finnish 'Kalevala' and kindred subjects. His disciples, too, are following on the same lines with even a stronger bent towards abstract music.

The concluding paragraphs of an article are hardly a suitable place in which to give, even in outline, a history of this, the youngest among the legitimate folk-idioms of European music. 'It sometimes happens,' says Sir Hubert Parry, 'that 'a race numerically inferior takes the lead in such a speciality 'as musical taste.' A long and careful study of the works of Sibelius points to the conclusion that the Finns may possibly lead the way to a more chastened and sober taste in the art of music. Already we are accustomed to hear Sibelius described by the full-blooded realists of the day as reactionary. But reaction is often progress in disguise. Sibelius has reserved to

himself the right of using the older classical forms as well as those of the symphonic poem. He has ideas which could not always be suitably adapted to the latter, and a sense of form such as one would expect to find in a man to whom sculpture makes a greater appeal than painting. Noting his tendency to shed much of the extravagant luxury of means employed by contemporary composers; his omission of much that is superfluous, or merely reiterative; his restraint in the matter of temperamental explosions, and his dislike of violent and noisy orchestration; his choice of themes which are not mere flashlights but sufficiently sustained and luminous to be the guiding stars of his movements; and his susceptibility to the undertones of nature—we are justified in feeling that Sibelius is no reactionary, but that perhaps on the contrary he has stepped ahead out of the dust and din of the blatant and motley pageantry which at the present moment occupies the high-road of musical progress. But this is a fresh subject, and worthy of separate treatment, although it touches very closely the legitimate and natural uses of native idiom in music.

To return to our own situation. National style, as distinct from national dialect, embraces many qualities and requirements. It necessitates a complete sympathy with our own people, and a grasp of their needs, both primary and secondary: profound knowledge of our own characteristic literature: love of our landscape and scenery (who, for example, is more fitted to write an 'Ocean symphony' than an Englishman?) And finally it necessitates, in the words of MacDowell, the power 'to put into our music what the 'nation has put into its life.' Fortunately we have some hopeful examples of national style in our contemporary music. It is certain that they will not remain isolated specimens of our musical imagination. Meanwhile, at the present juncture, fewer compositions and a more discriminating judgment, less talk and more concentrated effort, these are the urgent needs of the musical life of England.

ROSA NEWMARCH.

ZOOLOGY IN THE TIME OF SHAKESPEARE

1. **The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England.** By FOSTER WATSON. Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons. 1909.
2. **Shakespeare. (English Men of Letters.)** By Sir WALTER RALEIGH. Macmillan and Co. 1907.
3. **Turner on Birds : a Short and Succinct History of the Principal Birds noticed by Pliny and Aristotle, first published by Dr. William Turner, 1544.** Edited by A. H. EVANS. Cambridge University Press. 1903.
4. **Coursing and Falconry. (Badminton Library.)** By HARDING COX, CHARLES RICHARDSON, and GERALD LASCELLES. Longmans, Green and Co. 1899.
5. **Medieval Lore : being Classified Gleanings from the Encyclopaedia of Bartholomew Anglicus on the Properties of Things.** By ROBERT STEELE. Elliot Stock. 1893.
6. **Geschichte des Physiologus.** By FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT. Strassburg : K. J. Trubner. 1889.
7. **The Ornithology of Shakespeare, critically examined, explained, and illustrated.** By JAMES EDMUND HARTING. John Van Voorst. 1871.

THROUGH the Middle Ages natural science was a study of the written word of ancient writers, whose authority went unquestioned. Processes of observation or experiment were barely known. To this medieval tradition the age of Shakespeare, in its attitude to scientific study, was to a large extent loyal. Authority was still final and definite. What Galen and Hippocrates, Aristotle and Pliny had written was subject-matter for dialectic, for discussion, for argument, but not for direct investigation. In the same way the new light derived from the Arabs, which spread through the learned world at the latter end of the twelfth and at the beginning of the thirteenth centuries, was treated as a matter for dialectics by those who set the written word before actual observation or experiment in Nature.

Let us consider the books in English at the disposal of an average man in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Through medieval times had drifted a certain 'corpus' of moralised natural history known as the 'Physiologus,' which

was in essence a *Bestiarium*. It took various forms, and was read throughout Europe and the Near East. This 'Physiologus' was primarily religious in its aim, but dealt not only with the animals mentioned in the Bible but with other and often mythical monsters. Scientifically the zoology of the 'Physiologus' was of the poorest: in fact, the study of zoology was at its worst during the Middle Ages; it had fallen far lower than in classical days. The 'Physiologus' had its origin in Alexandria in early Christian times, and was translated into many tongues, including Coptic. It was sometimes fathered upon Ambrose but is older than his day.

During the eleventh century a certain 'Episcopus incertus,' one Theobaldus, made a metrical version of the descriptions of twelve of the animals dealt with in this little volume. This was published under the name 'Physiologus Theobaldi Episcopi de naturis duodecim āiālium,' the earliest printed edition being that issued at Delft in 1487. Numerous editions were published in many countries for the following century or two, but the contents of the volume were in a state of flux, additions and omissions appearing in many of the issues.

Another most voluminous and remarkable work was the 'Speculum naturale' of that marvellous compiler Vincent of Beauvais. It was an encyclopaedia of natural objects, and a mine of information which has since been frequently quarried. Vincent was a learned Dominican born in France about 1190. We know almost nothing of him except that he died about 1264. He is presumed to have lived in the Dominican House at Beauvais, but there is no evidence in support of the story that he was Bishop of that diocese. The 'Speculum naturale,' like his other monumental tomes, shows no originality and no first-hand knowledge of the animals he describes, but his industry was colossal and his application untiring. As an example of his erudition it may be mentioned that in the 'Speculum naturale' he quotes the names of no fewer than three hundred and fifty different authors, Latin, Greek, and Arab. The work was magnificently produced in 1473 by Jean Mentelin of Strassburg.

But the chief book on natural history in the Middle Ages was an encyclopaedia entitled 'Liber de Proprietatibus Rerum,' compiled by the English Franciscan, Bartholomew, often called Bartholomaeus Anglicus, who probably wrote sometime about 1250, certainly before 1267, and in all probability before 1260.

Both before and after the invention of printing this work had a wide circulation. The 'Liber' was translated into French by the order of Charles V, into Spanish in 1372, then into Dutch, and in 1397 into English. It was also the first book printed on paper which had been made in England. This book is believed to have been the source of much of Shakespeare's knowledge of natural history. In 1582 the Rev. Stephen Bateman, D.D., domestic chaplain to Bishop Parker, re-issued the English translation made by John of Trevisa which had been printed in 1494 by Wynkyn de Worde at Westminster. The book was entitled

> 'Bateman uppon Bartholome. His Booke De Proprietatibus Rerum: newly corrected, enlarged, and amended, with such Additions as are requisite, unto every severall Booke. Taken foorth of the most approved Authors, the like heretofore not translated in English. Profitable for all Estates, as well for the benefite of the Mind as the Bodie.' Lond. 1582, fol. Dedicated to Lord Hunsdon.

Incomplete translations of Pliny from the French had appeared in 1565, and again in 1587. In 1601 Philemon Holland, M.D. (1552–1637), in later life headmaster of Coventry Grammar School—'the translator generall in his age,' as Fuller calls him—published a more complete version of Pliny under the title 'The History of the World, commonly called the 'Natural Historie of Caius Plinius Secundus.' This treats of all phases of nature, and contains a record of all natural knowledge up to the time of the younger Pliny. Nor must it be forgotten that the writings of Pliny and the 'Georgics' of Virgil were in constant use in the schools.

In the middle of the thirteenth century Roger Bacon had pointed out that 'There are two ways of knowing, viz. by 'means of argument and by experiment,' but for three centuries onward it was 'argument' which held the field. Not that the sixteenth century failed to produce enlightened men who were to preach a new doctrine. In his educational work 'De 'Tradendis Disciplinis' (1523) Vives advocates 'nature study' and even uses the expression. He tells us 'That although the 'writings of the old Greeks and Romans are the opinions of 'learned men, yet not even all these opinions and judgments 'are to be accepted.' Vives recommends that the pupil should

first be shown what he can most readily perceive by the senses :

' So will he observe the nature of things in the heavens, in clouds and in sunshine, in the plains, on the mountains, in the woods. Hence he will seek out and get to know many things from those who inhabit those spots. Let him have recourse, for instance, to gardeners, husbandmen, shepherds, and hunters, for this is what Pliny and other great authors undoubtedly did ; for any one man cannot possibly make all observations without help in such a multitude and variety of directions. But whether he observes anything himself, or hears anyone relating his experience, not only let him keep eyes and ears intent, but his whole mind also, for great and exact concentration is necessary in observing every part of nature.'

We can but judge the state of zoology in Queen Elizabeth's time by the books and writings that have come down to us, and if we enquire what books and writings were available, they will be found to fall under the three headings, Medicine, Fieldcraft, and Heraldry. From these subjects the paths of progress in that science were advancing and converging.

The year that saw the birth of Shakespeare witnessed in the remote island of Zante the death of Vesalius, who, as a medical student at a hospital in Venice, had rubbed shoulders with a young soldier, Ignatius Loyola, who six years later founded the Order of the Jesuits. Vesalius, who was born at Brussels on the last day of the year 1514, was the first biologist to abandon authority. Dispensing with the aid of unskilled barbers, he dissected the human body with his own hands. Like Harvey, whose discovery of the circulation of the blood dates but three years after Shakespeare's death, he

' sought for Truth in Truth's own Book,
The creatures, which by God Himself was writ,
And wisely thought 'twas fit,
Not to read Comments only upon it,
But on the original itself to look.'

At the beginning of his scientific career, like his master Sylvius, Professor at the College of France, Vesalius trusted the written word of Galen more than he trusted his own eyesight, but in the end his sight and his reason conquered, and at last he taught only what he himself could see and make his students see.

Vesalius was the founder of modern anatomy, physiology, and, I think we may say, also of modern zoology, for the methods of

these sciences are one. His great work on ' The Structure of ' the Human Body ' appeared at Basle in 1543, and was beginning to have influence in England, but only amongst the learned, well before Shakespeare was born.

His English pupils, amongst whom was John Caius the third, founder of Gonville and Caius College, helped to spread his methods and principles in this country. Amongst the many pupils of John Caius we may mention Thomas Moffett. Few men in those days lived much over fifty years, and Moffett, born in 1553, died in 1604. He joined Trinity College in 1569, but migrated to Caius in 1572, where he was nearly poisoned by eating mussels. After taking his M.A. degree, he, as was the habit of the time, studied abroad and received in 1578 the degree of M.D. at Basle, where he was a pupil of Felix Plater and of Zwinger. The following year he travelled in Spain and Italy, and in these countries he made an elaborate study of the silkworm, which doubtless led him to the study of insects in general. He not only wrote a poem on the silkworm but collected notes on the natural history of the Insecta. These were published thirty years after his death under the title ' Insectorum sive ' Minimorum Animalium Theatrum—ad vivum expressis ' Iconibus super quingentis illustratum.' An English translation entitled the ' Theater of Insects ' was published as an appendix to Topsell's ' History of Four-Footed Beasts and Serpents ' in 1658.

Moffett was a many-sided man of science, a practising physician, a traveller who at Copenhagen had known Tycho Brahe, a courtier who took part in both diplomatic and military service abroad, a poet and writer of epitaphs and epigrams, a keen critic of diet, and for some time a member of the House of Commons.

A friend of Moffett's was Thomas Penny, who entered Trinity College in 1550, and later became not only a Prebendary of St. Paul's but a sound botanist and entomologist. Like so many men of the time, Penny travelled extensively on the Continent. He visited Majorca, lived in the south of France, and worked in Switzerland with Gesner. He is believed to have been with Gesner when he died, and he certainly helped to arrange the natural history specimens which the great master left. It was probably through Penny that Gesner's drawings of butterflies passed into the care of Moffett, whose ' Theatrum ' states on

its title-page that it was begun by Edward Wotton, Conrad Gesner, and Thomas Penny.

The contents of books revealing new knowledge diffused themselves among the ordinary public in Shakespeare's time far more slowly than at present. On the other hand, studies were then far less specialised than they now are. For example, we find Milton placing medicine in the curriculum of a liberal education, and John Evelyn studying 'Physics' at Padua. Lord Herbert of Cherbury insists on the necessity of a gentleman being able to diagnose and treat disorders, and thinks he should have a knowledge of anatomy. 'Whosoever 'considers anatomy, I believe, will never be an atheist,' was one of his recorded sayings. Dealing with the matter broadly, I think we may endorse the statement of Mr. Foster Watson: 'It is noteworthy, that in both botany and zoology the main 'advances were made by professed physicians,' and we must not forget that Elizabethan botany was more advanced than Elizabethan zoology.

Something however was learned from husbandry and field sports. 'Let the student,' says Vives, 'have recourse, for 'instance, to gardeners, husbandmen, shepherds, and hunters,' and in 'De rebus rusticis' he says 'Let the boy read Cato, 'Varro, Columella, Palladius.' 'Vitruvius is important for 'naming with the greatest purity and accuracy most objects 'of the country.' Virgil with his marvellous account of apiculture and other agricultural pursuits was much read during this period.

The gentlefolk also in Queen Elizabeth's time were much interested in the study of heraldry, for indeed it was a very gentlemanly pursuit. Gerard Legh's 'Accedens of Armory' (1562), and John Guillim's 'A Display of Heraldry' (1610), included descriptions of creatures which enabled the owners of animal crests and supporters to appreciate the nature of what they bore and of what supported them.

In Shakespeare's time, although a knowledge of physiology and human anatomy was beginning to emerge, such subjects as comparative anatomy, morphology, and embryology were non-existent. In dealing with the animal kingdom, the first need of the earlier writers on zoology was to make some sort of classification, and even in the later Tudor times such attempts at classification rested almost wholly on external characteristics.

These arid catalogues of animals were usually lightened by the addition of notes on their habits—often of the quaintest and most bizarre description—and by short accounts of such medical properties as the fantastic pharmacy of the sixteenth century attributed to various beasts.

William Turner in 1544 published his 'Avium Praecipuarum 'quarum apud Plinium et Aristotelem mentio est, brevis et 'succincta historia,' dedicated to Edward Prince of Wales, afterwards Edward VI. Turner had been educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he knew Latimer and learned Greek from Ridley. He travelled much abroad and became an M.D. of Ferrara and subsequently of Oxford. Later in life he was ordained, and in 1550 he was appointed Dean of Wells, a post he was compelled to quit on the accession of Queen Mary. His business in life was theological controversy and he wrote many polemical works, but his pleasure was in natural history. He was a learned botanist, and he published a 'Libellus de re 'herbaria' in 1538. He also contributed a letter on British fishes to his friend Conrad Gesner, with whom he had worked at Zurich and with whom he constantly corresponded. As an example of the zoology available in Shakespeare's time, we may quote Turner's description of the grouse.

'Of the Lagopus,' from Pliny.

'The Lagopus is in flavour excellent, its feet shaggy as in a hare have given it this name. Otherwise it is white, in size as the Columbi; it is not eaten except in the land of which it is a native, since it is not tameable while living, and when killed its flesh soon putrefies. There is another bird of the same name, differing but in size from the Coturnices, most excellent for food with yellow saffron sauce. Of this Martial makes mention in the following verse :—

'If my Flaccus delights in the eared Lagopodes.'

Although this may seem to indicate that Turner was a mere translator and compiler, this is not the case. As Mr. Evans says :

'while attempting to determine the principal kinds of birds named by Aristotle and Pliny, he has added notes from his own experience on some species which had come under his observation, and in so doing he has produced the first book on Birds which treats them in anything like a modern scientific spirit . . . nor is it too much to say that almost every page bears witness to a personal knowledge of the subject, which would be distinctly creditable even to a modern ornithologist.'

A contemporary of Turner's, Edward Wotton (1492–1555), born at Oxford and elected a Fellow of Magdalen, travelled for several years in Italy. He took his M.D. at Padua, and later held high office in the College of Physicians, and has been described as 'the first English Physician who made a 'systematic study of natural history.' His book 'De Differentiis 'Animalium,' published two years before Turner's 'Historia' and dedicated to the same patron, acquired a European reputation. The copy of this book, a fine folio, in the British Museum is said to be 'probably unsurpassed in typographical excellence by any contemporary work.' 'De Differentiis Animalium' was deservedly praised by contemporary writers for its learning and for the elegance of its language.

Dr. Caius (1510–1573) in his terse style wrote 'De Canibus 'Britannicis libellus,' 1570, and this was 'drawne into Eng-'lishe' under the name 'Of Englishe Dogges' by Abraham Fleming in 1576 and published in London. Caius wrote his little book as a contribution to Conrad Gesner's 'History of 'Animals,' but owing to Gesner's death it was not incorporated in that work.

From the sixth year of Henry the Eighth until the death of Queen Elizabeth all the learned men of Europe who were interested in nature turned to Gesner, the incomparable naturalist of Zurich (1516–1565). Born of humble parents, he learned and taught and wrote with untiring perseverance and energy until he became the most erudite and the best known man of learning of his day. Quite apart from his acquirements in what we now regard as science, he was a most remarkable linguist and bibliographer. In 1537 he held the Professorship of Greek at Lausanne, and in his 'Mithridates' he made one of the earlier attempts at comparative philology, considering all language from the Ethiopic to the Gypsy. In this book he printed the 'Pater Noster' in no fewer than twenty-three tongues.

Amongst many other works of great importance his stupendous 'Historia Animalium' is perhaps the most remarkable. In the decade beginning 1540 Gesner began to collect material for his great Natural History. He read between two and three hundred volumes, he travelled extensively in Europe, interviewing and learning from agriculturalists, shepherds and hunters as well as 'Gelehrten.' Everywhere he was helped by the eager efforts of his fellow workers in natural history.

Just before Shakespeare's death in the year 1607, Edward Topsell, a member of Christ's College and in the matter of livings somewhat of a pluralist, published under the title ' The ' Historie of Foure-Footed beastes ' an abstract of Gesner, and in the next year followed it up with ' The Historie of Serpents,' both illustrated with charmingly quaint, if inaccurate, woodcuts. Topsell had, what the modern zoologist must have (but the possession in his time was less common), a sound knowledge of German, and to this knowledge his books owe much. These books give us a fair idea of what the educated in those days knew of zoology in all its aspects, and that these aspects covered a far wider area than, with the present expansion of knowledge, we can now contemplate under this single science, is shown by the title-page to Topsell's magnificent quarto volume :

' The History of Foure-Footed Beastes. Describing the true and lively figure of every Beast, with a discourse of their severall Names, Conditions, Kindes, Vertues (both naturall and medicinall), Countries of their breed, their love and hate to Mankinde, and the wonderful worke of God in their Creation, Preservation, and Destruction. Necessary for all Divines and Students, because the story of every Beast is amplified with Narrations out of Scriptures, Fathers, Phylosophers, Physitians, and Poets : wherein are declared divers Hyerogliphicks, Emblems, Epigrams, and other good Histories, collected out of all the Volumes of Conradus Gesner, and all other Writers to this present day. By Edward Topsell. London, Printed by William Jaggard, 1607.'

If now we leave the general consideration of the knowledge of the science of zoology accessible in Shakespeare's time, and turn to the acquaintance of the subject he displays in his writings, we shall find that he had just that knowledge which a quick, observant, intelligent man of the world who has not paid special attention to the matter would pick up in the course of his upbringing and of his career. We have the feeling that he is describing what he saw, that he is copying nature—as far as he knew it—without attempted emendation or improvement. His outlook on the world is always steady and sane.

A large number of books and a very large number of articles have been written about the ' Birds of Shakespeare,' ' Reptiles ' mentioned in Shakespeare's Plays,' ' The Natural History of ' Shakespeare ' etc., etc. On an inspection of these writings it seems that their authors have a common desire to exalt our

greatest dramatist at the expense of what must have been the truth. Novelists and writers of plays constantly put into the mouths of their creations remarks which in their judgment the speaker would utter under certain circumstances and at certain times. The fact that Hero refers to the lapwing and Bottom to the ousel is no proof that Shakespeare was a trained ornithologist. I should profoundly mistrust George Eliot's diagnosis of a species of land mollusc, yet Mr. Brooke strongly urged Mr. Casaubon to unbend and take up the study of conchology, although he had himself gone into science a great deal and 'saw it would not do.' In the 'Doctor's Dilemma' the physicians talk fluently and well about bacteria, but few of us would trust Mr. Bernard Shaw to make a 'pure culture.' In fact we can all talk a good deal about a subject, and even more readily let a puppet talk for us, without really knowing much about it. Still there is no doubt that, as far as a keen sportsman could study, under the conditions of the time he lived in, Shakespeare had studied nature at first hand. But it is as a sportsman, not as a zoologist or even as a naturalist, that he must be judged. Professor Raleigh tells us that 'it has been 'truly said that he was curiously unobservant of animated 'nature.' I doubt that 'truly.' He certainly adopted many of the traditions of the past without enquiry. Professional writers on zoology in Elizabeth's time did the same. That he misstated facts about the nightingale and the cuckoo is true, but even in this year of our Lord we have still much to learn and much to discard in our knowledge of the latter bird. If the 'glittering poetry' of the famous passage on bees in 'Henry V.' is not an accurate record of the economy of a hive, we may infer that, unlike Virgil, unlike Maeterlinck, and unlike Mr. Rudyard Kipling, Shakespeare never kept a bee. After all it is the Archbishop of Canterbury who is speaking, and I, who have read the lives of many Archbishops of Canterbury, cannot recall a really expert apiculturist amongst them all. In his allusions to field sports, as in so much else, he strikes one as amazingly competent. He made, when we judge him by the standard of his times, comparatively few mistakes; his metaphors drawn from the animal world were on the whole appropriate. In this as in all other aspects of his genius he had 'das Gefühl.'

Shakespeare certainly had a first-hand knowledge of falconry. In Elizabeth's time this sport was 'much esteemed

'and exercised.' People of all classes eagerly took part in it. To quote Mr. Harting:

'The rank of the owner was indicated by the species of bird which he carried. To a king belonged the gerfalcon; to a prince, the falcon gentle; to an earl, the peregrine; to a lady, the merlin; to a young squire, the hobby; while a yeoman carried a goshawk; a priest, a sparrowhawk; and a knave, or servant, a kestrel.'

The sport was however expensive, for it took much time and devotion to train the birds. Falconry in those times, as the flying machine is in ours, was in the air, and just as one now hears our undergraduates discussing carburetters, air-locks, sparking-plugs, and various vintages of petrol, so in the times of Queen Elizabeth the keen young men of Shakespeare's Plays discussed the various kinds of hawks and their habits.

The towering of a falcon is referred to in 'Macbeth' (II. iv. 12) in a sense that has since become unusual:

'On Tuesday last,
A falcon tow'ring in her pride of place
Was by a mousing owl hawk'd at and kill'd.'

At the present day the expression 'towering' is restricted to a bird that has been hit but which flies on for a space as though unhurt, and then suddenly and rapidly rises almost vertically before dropping dead. The probable explanation is that hemorrhage has filled the lungs or bronchial tubes with blood, and the upward rise is a despairing effort to get breath. In Harting's 'Ornithology of Shakespeare' there is an interesting chapter on Hawking, or as Shakespeare so often called it 'Birding,' with an account of all the apparatus of falconry. Here we may perhaps confine ourselves to explaining a few technical terms. 'Pitch'—(cf. 'How high a pitch his resolution soars')—indicates the height to which a hawk rises before he begins his swoop. The 'stanniel' to which Sir Toby Belch refers when he exclaims 'And with what wing the 'stanniel checks at it' ('Twelfth Night,' II. 5), is the 'stand-'gate' or kestrel hawk which hovers over a mouse much as Malvolio checks at Maria's letter dropped in his path. Another case where, according to Harting, Shakespeare refers to a particular species of hawk is when Mrs. Ford addresses Falstaff's page: 'How now, my eyas musket!' Musket was the name used by falconers for the male sparrow-hawk;

eyas indicates a fledgling. 'But there is, sir, an aiery of 'children, little eyases, that cry out on the top of the question, 'and are most tyrannically clapped for't: these are now the 'fashion.' Writing in the days of 'Peter Pan' and the 'Blue 'Bird' one feels that history does repeat itself. The 'tercel' is thought to have been the short-winged male goshawk as opposed to the 'tercel (or tassel) gentle,' the male of the larger-winged peregrine:

> 'O, for a falconer's voice
> To lure this tassel-gentle back again.'
> ('Romeo and Juliet,' II. ii. 158).

The lure consisted of a leather thong appended to a piece of metal or wood to which were attached a couple of birds' wings and a scrap of raw meat. This was either whirled round his head by the falconer or thrown some distance; at the same time the falconer shouted to attract the bird. Each falconer had his own call, which the hawks were taught to recognise. In the case of hawks that flew very high, a live pigeon restrained by a string was sometimes used as a lure.

The game or 'quarry' (cf. 'This quarry cries on havoc' 'Hamlet,' V. 2) differed with different hawks. The gerfalcon and peregrine were flown at water-fowl, pigeons, rooks, and magpies; the goshawk at partridges and hares; small forms, such as the merlin and hobby hawk, at larks and blackbirds.

In the passage

> 'If I do prove her haggard,
> Though that her jesses were my dear heart-strings
> I'ld whistle her off, and let her down the wind
> To prey at fortune'— ('Othello,' III. iii. 260)

'haggard' means a grown-up bird caught wild and untamed. It should be here mentioned that hawkers fly their birds against the wind; if flown 'down wind' they are apt to disappear altogether.

The 'mew' (cf. 'To-night she's mewed up,' 'Romeo and Juliet,' III. 4) was the 'place, whether it be abroad or in the 'house, where you set down your hawk during the time she 'raiseth or reproduceth her feathers.' The word is said to be derived from the French *mue*, or moult. At such a time great care must be taken of the birds, who under quite unnatural conditions are apt to pine and die. In Henry VIII's time the mews at

Charing Cross, which, according to Stowe, had sheltered the royal hawks since Richard II's reign, were converted into stables. Horses replaced hawks, but the name mews persisted. 'Mewses must exist,' as Mrs. Billickin tells us in 'Edwin 'Drood.'

Another technical expression connected with hawking is to 'imp':

> 'If then we shall shake off our slavish yoke,
> Imp out our drooping country's broken wing.'
> ('Richard II.' II. i. 291.)

This term indicates the replacement of a damaged feather, where the shaft remains, by a portion of a whole feather of another bird. The falconers knew each wing and tail feather and collected examples of each for use as required. The old damaged feather was pruned into what we may call a stump, and the substitute feather obliquely cut so as to fit into it. Sir John Sebright, quoted by Harting, tells us in his 'Observations 'on Hawking' that the falconer for the purpose of uniting the old stump with the new feather 'is provided with an iron 'needle . . . and after wetting the needle with salt and water' —notice the anticipation of our modern antiseptic methods— 'thrusts it into the centre of the pith of each part, as truly 'straight, and as nearly to the same length in each as may be. 'When this operation has been skilfully performed the junc- 'tion is so neat that an inexperienced eye would hardly 'discern the point of union.'

A cruel habit of sewing the upper and lower eyelid together with a thread to accustom the hawk to the 'hood' was termed 'seeling.' 'The wise gods seel our eyes' ('Antony 'and Cleopatra,' III. xiii. 112). Note also 'To seel her father's 'eyes up close as oak' ('Othello,' III. iii. 210), where Mr. Harting suggests the reasonable emendation 'close as hawks.'

Altogether Shakespeare mentions between seventy and eighty different birds, and as Pope reminds us 'with competent . . . 'knowledge.' His references to coursing are less numerous. Coursing is one of the oldest sports of which we have detailed record. Arrian, in 150 A.D., wrote a treatise upon coursing the hare, and with the true feeling of the sportsman says the coursers 'do not take their dogs out for the sake of catching a 'hare, but for the contest or sport of coursing, and they are glad

'if the hare escapes.' When matches were first made between the dogs is unknown, but during the reign of Elizabeth, and by her special command, 'laws of the Leash or Coursing' were drawn up by Thomas Duke of Norfolk. One of the few references made by Shakespeare to this sport is in the famous speech to the English soldiers at the siege of Harfleur:

> 'I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips,
> Straining upon the start.' ('Hen. V.' III. i. 31.)

Deer shooting with bow and arrow or cross-bow was also a favourite form of sport, and to this Shakespeare refers more frequently. It was a sport which appealed especially to ladies, for whom stands, or 'standings,' were erected, and the deer driven past by keepers or hounds. The deer were also followed on horseback. Mr. Harting, quoting a letter from Rowland White to Sir Robert Sidney, dated 12 September 1600, tells us that Queen Elizabeth 'is well and excellently dis-'posed to hunting, for every second day she is on horseback and 'continues the sport long.' In 1600 the Queen was in her sixty-seventh year.

In the opening scenes of Act IV of 'Love's Labour's Lost' Shakespeare refers to the 'standings' for ladies, and again in Act III of '3 Henry VI,' and also in 'Cymbeline' and 'The 'Merry Wives of Windsor.' Above all we must not forget 'What shall he have who kill'd the deer?' in 'As You Like 'It.' The fine description of the 'roan Barbary' in the last scene but one of 'Richard II' shows Shakespeare's love of a horse.

The mythical animals mentioned in Shakespeare's plays are the unicorn, the phoenix, the cockatrice or basilisk, the griffin, and the dragon. Pliny's unicorn, or monoceras, was an animal all compact of the stag, the elephant, the boar and the horse. It had a deep 'lowing voice,' and it is not surprising to learn that it 'cannot be taken alive.' Its single horn, two cubits in length, projected from the centre of its forehead. The unicorn was introduced into the royal arms when James VI of Scotland became James I of Great Britain and Ireland; but long before this time the traditional fight between the lion and the unicorn was mentioned by Spenser in his 'Faerie Queene':

> 'Like as the lyon, whose imperial poure
> A proud rebellious unicorn defyes.'

Shakespeare refers both to the unicorn and to the phoenix with an evident note of scepticism in 'The Tempest,' III. iii.:

> 'Now I will believe
> That there are unicorns; that in Arabia
> There is one tree, the phoenix' throne; one phoenix
> At this hour reigning there.'

Pliny also placed the phoenix in Arabia—still the most unexplored country in the world—but 'was not sure that its 'existence is not a fable.' According to the same authority the phoenix lives 540 years, and there is but one on the earth at a time. This rarity is dwelt on by Rosalind ('As You 'Like It,' IV. iii. 17), who anticipates Charles Lamb's 'If 'they were young phoenixes, indeed, that were born one in a 'year!' Its habit of expiring in what Mr. Crummles called a 'blaze of fireworks,' and from its bones and marrow engendering again 'at first a sort of small worm, which in 'time changes into a little bird,' were all well known to Shakespeare's characters.

Among other mythical animals to which Shakespeare frequently refers is the basilisk, or cockatrice, which is figured by Aldrovandus as a scaly, long-tailed animal with four pairs of legs, carrying a crown upon its beaked head. Topsell tells us:

> 'This Beast is called by the Graecian *Baziliscos* and by the Latine *Regulus*, because he seemeth to be the King of Serpents, not for his magnitude or greatnesse: For there are many Serpents bigger than he, as there be many foure-footed Beastes bigger than the Lyon, but, because of his stately pace, and magnanimious mind: for hee creepeth not on the earth like other Serpents, but goeth halfe upright, for which occasion all other Serpentes avoyde his sight. And it seemeth nature hath ordayned him for that purpose; for, besides the strength of his poyson, which is uncurable, he hath a certain combe or Corronet uppon his head, as shall be shewed in due place.'

Pliny records that the basilisk destroys all shrubs not only by contact, but even those it breathes upon, it burns up grass and breaks the stones, so tremendous is its noxious influence. The origin of this baleful creature was believed to be from a 'Cockes 'egge' laid when the 'Cocke groweth old . . . about the begin-'ning of the Dogge-dayes . . . and afterwards sat upon by a 'snake or toad.' Another school, however, held the view 'that 'the Cocke doth sit on that egge himselfe.'

The fatal effect of the eyes of the basilisk, 'redde, or some-'what inclyning to blacknesse,' is referred to many times in Shakespeare's plays. We give but two instances :

> 'I'll slay more gazers than the basilisk.'
> ('3 Hen. VI.' III. ii. 187.)
> 'Would they were basilisks, to strike thee dead.'
> ('Rich. III.' I. ii. 151.)

The only effective way of dealing with the basilisk was to 'exhibit,' as the doctors used to say, a weasel. The effluvium of this animal destroyed the cockatrice, but the weasel also perished.

On dragons one could write a volume. There was the unwinged class, such as the dragon of Wantley, and the 'laidley 'worme' of Lambton, and there was the winged dragon such as St. George slays on our sovereigns, 'more furious and wicked 'than the wormes,' one curiously reminiscent of the fossil plesiosaurs, the other of the pterodactyls. Most of the references, and there are some ten or twelve, in the plays are to the winged variety.

The griffin, which we must carefully distinguish from the gryphon, was a gigantic animal with, as Mandeville, who knew all about it, tells us, 'the body before as an Ele, and behind as a 'Lyon.' It was 'greater than eight Lyons' and could carry to its nest a horse with a man on its back or a yoke of oxen. It lived in places very inaccessible to men of medieval or Tudor times : in Bactria, according to Mandeville ; 'in the far northern 'mountains,' according to Olaus Magnus ; while Marco Polo locates it in Madagascar. Hotspur, who could not stand a pedant, says :

> 'Sometimes he angers me
> With telling me of . . .
> A clipt-winged griffin.'
> ('1 Hen. IV.' III. i. 152.)

The creatures which aroused most interest in Tudor times were those who could, even in a distant manner, mimic or be referred to man. The human being was the type, the lord of creation, the standard to which other animals must in structure and function conform. Hence monkeys, and in particular the anthropoid apes, had a paramount attraction. Seals and manatees (= mermaids) owed their popularity to the same

effort to refer the marine mammals to the standards of our poor humanity. As Trinculo says in ' The Tempest ' :

' Were I in England now, as once I was, and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver ; there would this monster make a man ; any strange beast there makes a man. When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian.' (' The Tempest,' II. ii. 29.)

Other animals of a dangerous and savage disposition such as bears and lions also proved—when behind stout bars—stimulating to the public, who probably tormented these unhappy carnivora to the limit of their endurance. Bear-baiting was of course common. The bears at Berne are a survival of these Tudor times, and illustrate the old-world habit of immuring bears in pits, a habitat alien to their nature and affording man but one aspect of their external bodily structure. Monstrosities, sometimes manufactured, as the mermaid is to this day fabricated in the East, by joining a monkey's head and body to a fish's tail, always excited interest and aroused the speculation of the uninformed.

Man is a collecting animal, and in the Middle Ages the monasteries and the churches were often the repositories of the various objects of nature and art amassed by the traveller and the connoisseur. The opening up of the sea route to the East, the discovery of America, and the consequent foundation of ' factories ' both in the East and in the West, combined with missions to ' ye heathern,' led to considerable accumulations of natural history objects, and to the formation of museums. But for the most part the collections remained in the house of the collector and were largely made up of archaeological and ethnological specimens. Before Shakespeare's date such collections were made on the Continent by Ulisse Aldrovandi (1527–1605), ' omnis fere eruditionis oceanus,' whose collection is still preserved at Bologna ; by Archduke Ferdinand II, in his castle of Ambras, near Innsbruck ; by Francesco Calzolari (Calceolari) of Verona, after whose father the flower is named ; by Berend Ten Brocke (Bernardus Paludanus), 1550–1633, of Enkhuizen, whose *Wunder-Kammer* was visited in 1592 by Frederick, Duke of Würtemberg—the ' Duke de Jamany ' of Dr. Caius ; by Felix Plater of Basle, and by many others. England, when she does not lead the way, is apt in such matters to lag a good deal behind

other countries, though with time she usually overtakes and surpasses those who have initiated new ideas. In the sixteenth century we had no collections that would compare with those on the Continent. What natural history specimens the country then possessed were scattered in noblemen's libraries, in churches, and in the apothecary's shop :

> ' In his needy shop a tortoise hung,
> An alligator stuff'd, and other skins
> Of ill-shaped fishes.'
>
> ('Romeo and Juliet,' V. i. 42.)

Shakespeare had no great museums or collections, or even experts to consult. It was not till far on in the seventeenth century that England took her proper position as a home of great and public collections. The way was led by John Ray and by John Tradescant and his son of similar name, whose museum was acquired in 1659 by Elias Ashmole, and by him presented to the University of Oxford in 1682.

If we make a classification of the various animals mentioned by Shakespeare we shall find that, with the exception of the coral whose skeleton alone he knew, his knowledge did not extend below the leeches and worms, the Annelida. He knew that leeches suck blood, and incorrectly, like Job, he extended this practice to the horse-leech *Aulostoma*, which as a matter of fact feeds on earthworms. The word worm is used in his plays in the most comprehensive way for all long, wriggly creatures, not only for Annelids but for reptiles and for dragons. ' Civil dissension is a viperous ' worm ' (' 1 Hen. VI.' III. i. 72). Cleopatra's asp is ' the pretty ' worm of Nilus ' ('Ant. and Cl.' V. ii. 243). In ' Measure for ' Measure ' (III. i. 17) ' the soft and tender fork of a poor worm ' is in all probability the forked tongue of a snake. Most insect larvae were also termed worms. ' The worms were hallow'd ' that did breed the silk ' (' Othello,' III. iv. 73), and again referring, without knowing it, to the rose chafer's larva, ' Why ' should the worm intrude the maiden bud? ' (' Rape of ' Lucrece,' 848).

His knowledge of molluscs was, though more accurate, in no sense wider. He knew the ' cockle (*Pecten*) hat ' of the pilgrim (' Ham.' IV. v. 25), but thought the animal ' sails seas ' (' Per.' IV. iv. 2) ; he mentions as articles of food ' the fresh-brook muscles ' (' Temp.' I. ii. 463); he knew, as all the world since classical times

had known, 'this treasure of an oyster' ('Ant. and Cl.' I. v. 44). Its tardiness ('As You Like It,' IV. i. 52) and its tenderness ('Ven. and Ad.' 1033) alike impressed him. The 'saucy cuttle' of Doll Tearsheet ('2 Hen. IV.' II. iv. 118) does not argue an acquaintance with the Cephalopods, but may have been a term of endearment or more probably a slang term for 'cut-purse.'

The Crustacea are but sparingly referred to. Shrimp ('Love's 'Labour's Lost,' V. ii. 594) is used as a paraphrase for babe. The crab, it is said, 'could go backward' ('Ham.' II. ii. 206). As a matter of fact it moves sideways, though sometimes with an oblique backward bias. Caliban makes the only reference to the large subdivision of the order, the Entomostraca, in 'all be turned to Barnacles' ('Temp.' IV. 249).

Although the comprehensive word 'worm' was widely used in Elizabethan days for the grubs, maggots, and caterpillars of insects, only the more obvious of the mature insects, the imagos, are mentioned by Shakespeare. The Orthoptera are represented by the cricket, 'as merry as crickets,' says Poins ('1 Hen. IV.' II. iv. 100), and by the grasshopper. Shakespeare knew and appreciated the effect on cattle of the 'breeze-fly.' Beetles are referred to several times without any attempt to discriminate between the genera or even families of this enormous order. It is improbable that Shakespeare recognised that the glow-worm which he mentions frequently in some of his most charming passages is as a rule a beetle. The Lepidoptera again appeal to Shakespeare's amazing sense of beauty:

> 'And pluck the wings from painted butterflies,
> To fan the moonbeams from his sleeping eyes.'
> ('Mid. Night's Dream,' III. i. 175.)

In spite of the wide use of the word worm, he also refers to the larvae of the Lepidoptera as 'grubs' ('Your butterfly was a 'grub,' 'Cor.' V. iv. 12), and as 'caterpillars' whose destructive effect on plants he well knew. Further he distinguished between the sun-loving butterflies and the moths which as a rule fly by night, and between the dance of gnats in bright sunshine and their retirement to sheltered spots when the sun goes in. He understood a maggot. His knowledge of the bee and its habits, as shown by the phrase 'thighs packed with 'wax,' and by the wonderful though in detail inaccurate speech of Canterbury ('Hen. V.' I. ii. 187) about the bees who

'teach the act of order to a peopled kingdom,' was the expression of centuries of observation from pre-classical times onwards. We must never forget that our ancestors had no cane-sugar, no beet-sugar, no saccharine.

Although Shakespeare seems to distinguish between the spider's poison, which is in some few genera harmful if injected into the blood and harmless when swallowed, it is hardly probable that he or any one in his epoch had considered this physiological difference. Spiders and their webs and threads were of course used as constant illustrations, but only one born and bred in the country would put into the mouth of Thersites 'I had rather be a tick in a sheep than such a valiant ignorance' ('Troilus,' III. iii. 315). The scorpion he must only have known by hearsay, but of the louse and the mite he evidently had first-hand knowledge.

Shakespeare knew fish from two aspects, as a sportsman and as a consumer. The carp in his day, as still in Central Europe, was an important article of food, and fishponds were a source of wealth. He naturally knew more of fresh-water fishes than of salt. Dace he knew as bait for pike. Eels, one regrets to learn, were put 'i' the paste alive' ('King Lear,' II. iv. 124). He speaks of 'this fool-gudgeon' and emphasises the traditional fecundity of the loach. Tench, trout, and salmon are all mentioned. The last-named, at times fresh-water, at other times marine, affords a transition to sea-fishes. In Elizabethan times there were no swift 'carriers,' no cold-storage, and the marine fishes consumed inland were such as could be 'cured.' The sprat, the pilchard, the stock-fish (salted cod), and above all the herring were evidently all common food. The great abundance of salted and cured fish was the direct consequence of the wholesome custom of 'fasting' then enforced by the Church. In those times, as still in Russia and Scandinavia, pickled fish was a favourite relish. The 'anchovies and sack 'after supper' ('1 Hen. IV.' II. iv. 588) recommended by Peto, the 'conger and fennel' ('2 Hen. IV.' II. iv. 266), still a favourite combination in the Channel Islands, and the 'soused gurnet,' i.e. gurnard ('1 Hen. IV.' IV. ii. 13) are still known.

The animals we now classify as amphibia were in Tudor times regarded as abhorrent. The 'engendering of toads' was hated, and this harmless and in some respects attractive animal was

looked upon as envenomed, foul, and poisonous. The toad or paddock was useful in a witches' broth, and the tailed amphibia (Urodela) newts and blind worms (or limbless lizards) were adjured to 'do no harm.' The tadpole, like the shrimp, is mentioned as a synonym for babe ('Titus Andronicus,' IV. ii. 85).

No animals are more frequently alluded to in Shakespeare's plays than the serpent, the adder, the viper, and the asp (aspick). Their love of the sun, the beauty of their 'painted skin,' their forked tongue are referred to over and over again. The view that adders are deaf, which still survives, is probably based on the absence of external ears. Some of Shakespeare's characters thought the double tongue the instrument which stung, but York ('3 Henry VI.' I. iv. 112) more correctly refers to the adder's tooth. Lear also (I. iv. 311) appreciates the 'serpent's 'tooth.' The blind-worm, one of the few lizards mentioned, is obviously classed by Shakespeare with the Ophidia, but he shows on the other hand some acquaintance with the habits of the chameleon. The tortoise, the alligator, and 'the mournful 'crocodile,' whose traditional hypocrisy is referred to by the queen in '2 Hen. VI.' III. i. 226, complete the list of reptiles. Turtle in all places means the turtle-dove, not the chelonian.

Shakespeare also shows much knowledge of our sparse mammalian fauna; the weasel, the ferret, the hedgehog, the rabbit or coney, the otter, the polecat or fitchew which was thought to be very amorous, the deer then as now confined in parks or forests, cattle and other farmyard and domesticated animals were all within his ken. A curious allusion of Gonzalo's ('Tempest,' III. iii. 45) to

> 'mountaineers,
> Dewlapp'd like bulls, whose throats had hanging at 'em
> Wallets of "flesh,"'

obviously refers to the goitre which was till recently common in the Peak district.

Shakespeare knew his dogs, and like all good men loved them: 'she hath more qualities than a water-spaniel; which is 'much in a bare Christian' ('Two Gent.' III. i. 271). He *must* have kept a water-spaniel.

One or two other expressions used by Shakespeare are now obsolete. Titania's 'rere-mice' ('Mid. Night's Dream,' II. ii. 4) are bats; Falstaff's 'gibbed cat' is a gelded cat; the puttock,

a kite ; the moldwarp with which Glendower bored Hotspur is the mole (*cf.* the German Maulwurf) ; the ' lugged bear ' was a baited bear. Certain animals such as the lion, the leopard, the tiger, the panther, the bear, the camel, the rhinoceros, and perhaps the ostrich were known in Elizabethan times in menageries. The frequent and on the whole unflattering mention of the cat seems to indicate that Shakespeare was aware that many people, like Queen Victoria and Lord Roberts, have an instinctive dislike to that mammal ; he may have shared it.

To the category of recorded creatures belong the ape and monkey :

> ' The strain of man's bred out
> Into baboon and monkey.'

as Apemantus says (' Timon of A.' I. i. 260), and the obvious resemblance between man and the lower primates excited in early times a very lively interest. I do not think, however, it would have occurred to Shakespeare, who was decidedly ' on ' the side of the angels,' to include them in one sub-order. His view, if less morphologically correct, was a higher one : ' What a piece of work is a man ! how noble in reason ! how ' infinite in faculty ! in form and moving how express and ' admirable ! in action how like an angel ! in apprehension how ' like a god ! '

A. E. Shipley.

ON SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

1. **Report of Select Committee of House of Commons.** H. C. 249 of 1887.
2. **Report of Departmental Committee on Life Saving Appliances.** C. 5762 of 1889.
3. **Report of Departmental Committee on Watertight Bulkheads.** C. 6405 of 1891.
4. **Merchant Shipping Acts 1894-1906.**
5. **Official Reports of Debates in House of Commons.** April and May 1912.
6. **Report of Committee of the Senate of the United States on Loss of Titanic.** May 1912.
7. **Proceedings before Right Hon. Lord Mersey (with Assessors) on a formal Investigation into the Loss of the Titanic.** May and June 1912.

THE foundering of the Titanic, less than three hours after collision with an iceberg, has involved a loss of human life and property of unprecedented magnitude, and has given a terrible shock to public confidence in the practical safety of ocean navigation by passenger steamships of modern types and large dimensions. Time was, and that not so long ago nor outside the memory of living men, when sails formed the chief means of propulsion for sea-going ships. Then, not infrequently, circumstances arose which no human power could control, even when the most skilled seamen were in charge. In those almost forgotten days changes in the types and equipment of ships were few and far between ; progress in dimensions had been slow ; experience and precedent were chiefly trusted to furnish rules for conduct of navigation ; scientific method in naval architecture was in its infancy ; steam was looked upon rather as an auxiliary than as a substitute for sail power. In these circumstances losses of ships at sea naturally came to be regarded as almost inevitable accidents. In most cases it was thought that accidents occurred from causes lying beyond human control ; consequent losses of life and property were attributed to ' an act of God ' ; and that phrase was in common use. Enquiries into the causes of loss were made, no doubt, but they were, as a rule, more or less formal, and the common verdict was as described. Now all this is changed.

Every serious accident to shipping, and all losses of life and property, become the subject of thorough investigation. Endeavour is made to ascertain the principal causes of accident or loss, to fix the responsibility so far as may be possible; to deduce from every maritime disaster lessons which shall aid and improve future practice, and thus to increase the safety of ships, passengers, and cargoes.

Speaking broadly, it may be said that every great maritime disaster which has occurred during the last forty years has been followed by an advance in knowledge, or by an improvement in practice, which has secured greater safety to life and property at sea and a distinct improvement in the design and construction of ships. It is unnecessary to multiply illustrations of this general statement because there will be universal agreement that it is correct; but, for the benefit of readers who are unfamiliar with the subject, one or two typical cases may be mentioned.

In September 1870 H.M.S. Captain was capsized in the Bay of Biscay when proceeding under sail in moderate weather. An enormous loss of life resulted and led immediately to a thorough investigation of the actual stability of all classes of existing warships. The principles of stability had long been understood, but the determination of actual stability for completed ships, by means of experiment and calculation, had not been customary; because, up to that date, the types of ships in use had not involved such a risk of capsizing under sail as was proved to have existed in the case of the low-freeboard turret-ship type represented by the Captain. From that time forward the determination of the conditions of stability for every new design of warship has become the rule; the provision of a proper margin of stability has been accepted as a paramount necessity which must be met.

Turning to the mercantile marine:—At a somewhat later date than the loss of the Captain cargo steamers were employed having a considerable ratio of depth to breadth; and experience had proved that, under ordinary conditions of lading, vessels of these proportions were liable to be capsized by the action of the sea, independently of serious wind-pressure on their limited sail-areas. In this case also scientific investigation of the causes of accidental loss led to an abandonment of types in which the stability was faulty, and to the adoption of better

proportions by means of which the risk of capsizing was diminished.

The question of the maximum load-lines for mercantile steamers furnishes another striking example of beneficial results obtained by means of enquiry into the conditions which have produced, or the circumstances which have attended, the losses of over-laden ships. The late Mr. Plimsoll probably pushed attacks upon shipowners, as a class, much too far, and made some statements which were exaggerated or baseless. On the other hand, his persistence had much to do with the setting up of enquiries which resulted in the enactment of a legal load-line for British mercantile steamships. Rules for fixing the load-line were based on a scientific analysis of the recorded experience and representative opinions of practically the interests which could be affected by the proposed legislation. Moreover, these rules were only framed after thorough investigation had been made of questions affecting the buoyancy, stability, and strength of ships. At the outset the rules were regarded by many shipowners as likely to hamper the working of British ships in competition with foreign vessels ; but long experience has proved that no serious damage has been done. On the contrary, the advantages of the new procedure as applied to British ships have been such that the system of assigning load-lines has now become international, and rules which are practically identical with British rules have been adopted by the principal maritime countries. It is a matter for congratulation that, in regard to both tonnage measurement and limit of loading, there is now a close approach to identity of regulations in the great mercantile marines of the world.

In the case of the Titanic, many circumstances made it natural, as well as necessary, that a special enquiry should take place ; and the proceedings of the Court of Enquiry, which has been set up by the Government under the presidency of Lord Mersey, have been watched, and will be watched, with close attention by all who are interested in the future of the British Mercantile Marine. A long series of specific questions has been framed by the Board of Trade, and the work of the Court of Enquiry involves the preparation (on the basis of authentic evidence) of trustworthy replies to those questions. A wide field has thus been opened ; the task of traversing it

and of reaching definite conclusions has no doubt been made more difficult in consequence of the representation of many distinct interests by Counsel and by the large number of witnesses examined. It is consequently reasonable to anticipate that a considerable time must be occupied in the performance of this important duty. The task is one of grave responsibility, and it would obviously be improper to attempt to deal with matters definitely referred for consideration to Lord Mersey and his colleagues until their report has been presented and made public.

On the other hand, it is obvious that—outside the actual circumstances of the loss of this great ship and the individual responsibilities connected therewith—a lively and general public interest has been awakened in points of principle affecting the safety of life and property at sea. To such points attention may be usefully directed, and no harm can be done by considering whether or not new departures will have to be made from established practice in consequence of this unparalleled disaster.

Already discussions have occurred, in the Press and in Parliament, which have brought into prominence certain unfounded yet popular beliefs in regard to the guarantees of safety hitherto provided in modern passenger steamships. It has become evident that false conceptions have been generally current in regard to an assumed practical immunity from loss, because recent years have witnessed the construction of vessels of huge dimensions in which, what are commonly described as, ' all ' modern improvements ' have been embodied. One of the most marked characteristics of the comments made on the foundering of the Titanic has been the expression of surprise and grievous disappointment, that a ship which exceeded in tonnage all other completed vessels, and had been publicly described on high authority as ' practically unsinkable,' should have foundered in mid-Atlantic on her first voyage and caused the loss of fifteen hundred precious lives. In these circumstances it may be of service to show how this popular belief in the immunity of the Titanic and other large modern passenger steamships from serious accident has grown up, and to endeavour to make deductions from the facts attending her loss which may be of use in preventing similar accidents in future.

This can be done without in any way trespassing on the

province of Lord Mersey's Court. The main facts and incidents relating to the loss of the Titanic have been established and are public property. The Committee appointed by the Senate of the United States of America and presided over by Senator Smith was certainly rough and ready in its methods, and its procedure was lacking in judicial decorum, if not in impartiality. It did, however, place on record the principal facts obtainable from survivors, and its findings as to facts have been only confirmed or slightly amended by the proceedings in Lord Mersey's Court. Having this solid basis of fact to work upon, there will be no impropriety in founding thereon an examination of the opinions which have hitherto prevailed in regard to the safety of life and property at sea, and in making a few suggestions in regard to the possibility of securing an increase of safety.

How did it come about that the Titanic was regarded by the general public, and even by the majority of the passengers on board at the time of the accident, as a practically 'unsinkable' ship? The answer to that question is simple; the public had been informed that she had been constructed so that she would be practically unsinkable, and although that assertion was qualified in authorised descriptions of the great ship, writers in the press either did not understand or did not fully appreciate the qualification of the original statements, and repeated the phrase 'practically unsinkable' again and again without any qualification. For instance, a reputable technical magazine (*The Shipbuilder*, Summer Number 1911) which issued a special number wholly devoted to a detailed description of the Olympic and Titanic, containing a mass of information obtainable only from the owners and builders of the vessels, made the following statement: 'The captain can, by simply moving an electric 'switch, instantly close the (watertight) doors throughout and 'make the vessel practically unsinkable.' Such a statement naturally caught the eye of the general reader, and produced the popular belief with which we are now dealing. In the same pages, however, a considerable qualification of this claim to unsinkability was expressed in the following passage, which unfortunately did not equally impress the public mind: 'The watertight subdivision is very complete, and is so arranged 'that any two main compartments may be flooded, without in 'any way involving the safety of the ship.' Between a provision against foundering measured by the capacity to withstand a

simultaneous flooding of ' two main compartments,' and the ' practical unsinkability ' of the ship there is obviously a great gulf. When the Titanic came into collision with the iceberg at least five of the compartments forward were, within a few seconds, injured and thrown open to the access of the sea. From that moment the fate of the great ship was sealed, and the fact was recognised by experts immediately after they had ascertained the extent of the damage. Mr. Andrews—the man on board most familiar with the design of the ship—knew that the phrase ' practically unsinkable ' applied to the Titanic only when the damage affected simultaneously not more than two main compartments, and that she must founder when five were thrown open to the sea. The passengers did not recognise the distinction between the two cases ; they clung to the phrase so often reiterated. Their view was not unreasonable ; it was shared by the chief business representative of the White Star Company in the United States, who publicly expressed his belief that the Titanic was practically unsinkable even after news of the collision with an iceberg had reached New York. Facts such as these illustrate the manner in which popular descriptions of technical details may, and frequently do, foster erroneous impressions on the public mind. No educated naval architect would have dreamed of making the assertion that the Titanic or any other modern passenger steamship was practically unsinkable under all the conditions and accidents occurring in actual service. Text-books of Naval Architecture contain clear statements in the contrary sense. As an example the following extract may be given from a book published long ago, and in reading this passage it should be borne in mind that warships are built to withstand underwater attacks, as well as the effects of gunfire, while they are not required to afford accommodation for passengers. Warships are therefore much more minutely subdivided into watertight compartments than passenger steamships can be, and are consequently less liable to founder ; but even warships of modern types are not unsinkable, as was proved repeatedly during the war between Russia and Japan.

' It cannot be claimed for the most minutely subdivided warship that she is absolutely unsinkable. Comparatively large spaces have to be provided for engines, boilers, and equipment, and this puts a practical limit on the minuteness of watertight subdivision. More-

over, the damage inflicted by ramming or torpedo attacks may be so extensive as to throw several compartments open to the sea simultaneously. On the other hand, the chances of escape are obviously increased as the subdivision is made more thorough. If the primary consideration in the design of a ship were to make her as nearly as possible unsinkable, it would clearly be desirable to associate extensive subdivision into watertight compartments with the use of cork, or other packing materials of small specific gravity. By this means, if there were no limitations of size or cost, it might be possible to produce a vessel which could sustain a very considerable amount of damage before it ceased to be buoyant. The internal spaces to which water could find access would, in the aggregate, bear a small proportion to the reserve of buoyancy, and when damaged the condition of the vessel would resemble that of a water-logged timber-laden ship. The drawbacks to this system are great ; size, cost, and propulsive power would all require great increase, and it is scarcely probable that the plan will ever find favour, except on a limited scale. The system is applied, to some extent, in lifeboats and to certain limited portions in special classes of warships, wherein the whole or a portion of the length is protected by a strong deck.' ('Manual of Naval Architecture,' edition of 1882).

The importance of the above considerations will be made clearer to the ordinary reader if a brief outline is given, in popular language, of the fundamental principles upon which the practice of watertight subdivision is based.

When a ship is floating at rest in still water it displaces a volume of water which is identical in form with the submerged portion of the ship situated below the surface of the water. The cavity in the water occupied by the submerged portion of the ship is termed her 'displacement' : if this cavity were filled with water of the same density as the water which surrounds the ship, the weight of that water would exactly equal the weight of the ship and all that she carries. A variation in the density of the water in which a ship floats will effect a variation in the volume of displacement and consequently in the draught, apart from any change in the total weight of the ship. For instance, suppose a ship to be loaded in the London Docks, where the water is comparatively fresh and weighs about 63 lbs. per cubic foot ; and suppose that she is subsequently towed to the Channel without consuming any coal or other item of her lading, so that her total weight remains unchanged. In the Channel the sea-water weighs 64 lbs. per cubic foot : consequently a less volume of sea-water than of dock-water will furnish buoyancy equal to the total weight of the ship ;

and the ship will therefore float at less draught than that at which she floated in the docks. The general principle is that the buoyancy—that is to say, the weight of water displaced by the ship—must always be equal to the total weight of the ship.

It will be obvious that one condition essential to the flotation of a ship is her possession of a watertight envelope or skin, which can exclude the surrounding water from her interior and be capable of resisting the pressure of the water. In a coracle the skin of an animal constitutes this essential envelope, and is supported by a light frame of wicker work. The skins of wooden ships consist of planks laid upon and fastened to transverse ribs closely spaced and capable of withstanding external pressure ; the seams of these planks are made watertight by caulking. In iron and steel ships the skins are formed of thin plates—not usually exceeding an inch in thickness in the largest ships—supported by strong internal transverse framing, bulkheads, longitudinal girders, decks and other parts of the structure ; the joints of this skin-plating are made watertight by riveting and caulking. In all classes of ships and boats the watertight skins are carried to some height above the water-line ; and in sea-going ships the water-excluding structure is completed by means of decks or deck-houses. In order to provide for light, air, and passage-ways, openings have to be formed in the sides and upper decks of a sea-going ship, but means are provided for closing these openings in a watertight fashion when necessary. That portion of the volume of a ship which is situated above the load water-line, but from which water can be excluded, constitutes what is called her ' reserve of buoyancy,' just as the volume submerged below the water-line constitutes her ' buoyancy ' or displacement. In different types of ships the proportion of this reserve of buoyancy to the displacement varies greatly. Submarines, for example, being intended for diving, have reserves of buoyancy which are only a small percentage of the displacement ; but as this type has been increased in size and sea-going capability the percentage has been enlarged. Modern passenger steamers have high ' free-' board,' their uppermost decks being placed at a considerable height above water—in the Titanic the boat-deck was more than 60 feet above water—and their reserve of buoyancy is

equal to or greater than their displacement. This feature, although primarily due to the provision of large and luxurious accommodation for passengers, adds greatly to the security against foundering, provided that there are adequate means for limiting, by a good system of watertight subdivision, the amount of water that is able to enter the ship when the skin is pierced.

Attention may now be turned to the condition of a ship which has had the water-excluding skin damaged or broken under water by grounding or collision. Through the damaged portions of the skin, water will find access to the interior of the ship, and the vital questions are : (1) What is the total volume to which water can find access ? and (2) What will be the proportion of the volume of water which enters to the reserve of buoyancy of the ship ? Much will depend on the extent of the damage done, on the vertical and longitudinal position of the injured parts, and on the system of watertight subdivision adopted in the ship. It is, however, obvious that in all cases the limitation of the volume of the space to which water can find access must contribute to the safety of the vessel and her chances of escape from foundering. If her interior is largely occupied by a bulky cargo and there is little space to which water can find access she may be actually unsinkable, without subdivision. Wood-built timber-laden vessels, as is well known, will keep afloat even when ' water-logged ' : and they do so because the logs are lighter than water, and are so stowed that the interspaces between the logs are relatively small in volume, so that the amount of water which can enter is also small in proportion to the reserve of buoyancy. This is an extreme example of the general principle that no ship can be ' unsinkable ' unless the total volume of unoccupied hold-space to which water can find access when her skin is broken through is less than the volume constituting her reserve of buoyancy.

In passenger steamships of high speed the provision needed for the accommodation of passengers and for the installation of propelling apparatus necessarily involves the existence in the interior of large spaces to which water would find access in case of under-water injuries if there were no efficient system of watertight subdivision. Long ago the Chinese grasped the principle underlying this statement, and sought increased safety from loss following upon collision or grounding by means of

transverse watertight partitions (or bulkheads) built across the holds of wooden ships, and secured in a watertight fashion to the sides. With these arrangements, when a blow was struck between two bulkheads, water could find access only to the compartment between them, and in ships of the low speeds and small sizes then in use this was probably the common case. In present circumstances, with ships of enormous dimensions and extremely high speeds, the consequences of accident are much more serious, but the same principles apply as those which were recognised and acted upon by the Chinese at a period when British ships were of very primitive types and the simplest construction.

The substitution of iron for wood as the material for shipbuilding naturally emphasised the importance of watertight subdivision, although it is probable that European shipbuilders were not aware of what had been done in China. When steel took the place of iron, the conditions which made watertight subdivision a matter of supreme importance remained unchanged. Steel is now almost universally employed for ships' structures. The remarkable ductility of mild steel is a quality in which it is vastly superior to iron, and in many circumstances where iron plating would have been fractured by grounding or collision, steel-plating has been simply 'dented' and has remained watertight. Nevertheless the thinness of steel skin-plating makes its perforation easy in case of grounding or collision. The specific gravity of steel is nearly 7·8 times that of pure water and about seven and a half times that of sea water. From the start it was recognised by builders and owners that greater security against risks of fire and foundering could be obtained with iron and steel ships than with wooden ships, if numerous watertight bulkheads were fitted and subdivision made minute. On the other hand, it was seen that such a multiplication of separate compartments would sensibly affect the cost of loading or discharging cargoes, and would hamper the designer in providing accommodation for passengers. Experience also showed that with proper care in navigation the risk of serious accident was remote, and the percentages of loss of life and property were very small in proportion to the enormous trade done in the sea-transport of passengers and cargo. In other words, commercial considerations had to be taken into account as well as possible increase in safety, and

a similar conflict of interests still continues. Shipowners have hitherto strenuously opposed the introduction of compulsory legislation for British ships in connexion with watertight subdivision. As the law now stands the watertight bulkheads required to be fitted to steamships are as follows: A 'collision' bulkhead placed not less than one-twentieth of a length of the ship abaft the stem; a 'stuffing-box' bulkhead placed in front of each stern tube, with a shaft tunnel (or an alternative means of preventing leakage into the ship) extending to the after end of the engine-room; an efficient and watertight bulkhead at the after end of the engine-room, and another at the fore end of the stokehold. These bulkheads obviously would not provide adequately for security in passenger steamships of modern types and large dimensions; and in practice the minimum legal provision is greatly exceeded. The Titanic, for example, had fifteen transverse watertight bulkheads dividing the hold into sixteen compartments, only one of which exceeded 57 feet in length. It is proper to remark that the Marine Department of the Board of Trade has consistently endeavoured to bring about a better condition of things than that contemplated by the Merchant Shipping Acts, and these efforts have been aided by the sympathy and support of the great Registration Societies, of many leading shipowners, and of the Admiralty. Up to date, however, although much improvement has been effected in the subdivision of passenger steamships, this has been accomplished by indirect means, and not by legislation.

In this paper it is impossible to trace the progress of improvement in watertight subdivision. Some idea of what has been accomplished may be obtained from the statement that about thirty years ago, when the Admiralty were forming a list of merchant steamships suitable for naval use, they were compelled to accept ships which could remain afloat in moderate weather when only one compartment was flooded; and they could not then find more than a few vessels fulfilling even this modest condition. In 1890 a special Committee was appointed by the Board of Trade to consider the subject of bulkheads in connexion with the provision of boats and life-saving appliances. The exigencies of trade, as well as safety from foundering, were avowedly taken into account by this Committee, which reported that for first-class ocean-going

passenger steamers 425 feet in length and upwards, and for cross-Channel passenger steamers, the highest standard of subdivision to be contemplated (in fixing equipments of boats, &c.) should provide for flotation with two compartments thrown open to the sea. That standard of subdivision usually represented a case where the transverse bulkhead separating two flooded compartments ceased to be watertight. From that time onward this standard has been accepted as sufficient in most, but not in all, British passenger steamships wherein the subdivision is effected solely by means of transverse watertight bulkheads.

Other means of watertight subdivision are employed in a few merchant ships and in all warships. One of the best examples of effective subdivision to be found, even at this day, is the Great Eastern, designed by Isambard Brunel in 1855. The remarkable foresight and skill displayed in this part of his work by that great engineer deserve to be recorded afresh. The Great Eastern was 680 feet long and 83 feet wide—dimensions which were not reached in any other vessel until the present century had begun. Her watertight subdivision compares favourably with that of any passenger steamship at present in existence.

The principal classes of risk which must be kept in view when dealing with the arrangement of watertight compartments are admirably illustrated by the provisions made in the Great Eastern. First there is the risk of grounding or striking rocks, which is mainly felt in the bottom of a ship below the ' turn of the bilge.' Brunel met this risk by giving to the Great Eastern a ' cellular double bottom ' formed by fitting an inner skin to the ship and by subdividing the space between the two skins (about 3 feet in depth) into a number of separate and small compartments. The value of this arrangement was conclusively demonstrated on service, when the great ship ran ashore off the American coast and tore a hole 80 feet long in her outer skin. The inner skin was uninjured, only a small quantity of water entered the double bottom, the draught and trim of the vessel were little disturbed, and she proceeded on her voyage in perfect safety. Cellular double bottoms are now universally adopted as a means of safety and as receptacles for water ballast.

A second class of accident is that where a ship strikes another

ship nearly 'end-on,' and, driving her bow into the side of the ship struck, receives serious injuries to her forward end. Against this risk the Great Eastern had the security of a transverse collision bulkhead, placed about 60 feet abaft the stem, injury to this partition being unlikely in the circumstances described. The universal practice of shipbuilders at present, and the requirements of the Merchant Shipping Acts, follow the lead given by Brunel. Every steel ship now has a collision bulkhead at some distance abaft the stem. The ship which is struck nearly end-on, especially if she has her side broken through at or near a transverse bulkhead, is exposed to great risks. Brunel recognised the necessity for providing against these risks and fitted ten transverse bulkheads in the Great Eastern; but he was not content with that provision; he supplemented it by other structural arrangements. The cellular double bottoms of merchant steamships usually extend up to the bilges or a little above. Brunel carried the cellular construction and double skins up to a height of about 6 feet above the load water-line. A comparatively light (grazing) collision, therefore, might have left the inner skin intact and have involved the entrance of only a small quantity of water, even if a considerable length of the outer skin above the bilge was injured. A heavier graze or a less oblique impact would, no doubt, have involved injury to the inner skin, and have enabled water to enter the hold of the ship. The space to which it could find access, however, was limited by means of the transverse bulkheads, and by two longitudinal watertight bulkheads placed more than twenty feet inside the outer skin. These longitudinal bulkheads extended over the whole region occupied by the engines and boilers (about half the length of the vessel), and rose to the upper deck situated at a considerable height above water. The spaces between these bulkheads and the sides of the ship were utilised as coal-bunkers. Only an extraordinary accident could have injured these bulkheads or have destroyed their utility as barriers to the access of water into engine-rooms and stoke-holds. Obviously if water had flooded large spaces of the coal bunker on one side of the Great Eastern, she would have heeled over towards the damaged side; but that heel could have been corrected by admitting water to the other side if so desired; and, in any case, it is improbable that it would

have involved serious danger to the vessel or imperilled her buoyancy.

Scott Russell was associated with Brunel in building the Great Eastern, and also took part in the design of the Warrior, the first sea-going ironclad of the Royal Navy, designed in 1859. In that vessel methods of subdivision similar to those described for the Great Eastern were adopted. During the half-century which has followed the completion of the Warrior it may be said that the watertight subdivision of all warships has been influenced by the arrangements adopted in the Great Eastern, although the actual subdivision has been made more minute. It is an accepted principle in warships that every partition, platform, or deck built primarily for purposes of stowage of ammunition, provisions, stores, equipment, and coals, or for the installation of machinery and boilers, shall be made watertight, if that be possible, and that all necessary openings in these partitions shall be fitted with watertight covers or doors. But even when considerable subdivision has been secured, absolute security is not attainable ; warships are not unsinkable although they are not easily sunk. In passenger ships, longitudinal watertight bulkheads have only been fitted in a few instances, although it cannot be denied that their presence would add, in all cases, to security against the effects of a collision, especially when it takes the form of a grazing blow which injures the skin of the ship over a considerable length. This is what happened when the Titanic struck the iceberg. Her side plating, at a small height above the top of the cellular bottom, was broken through or driven in by the submerged and sharp edges of the ice ; its watertightness was destroyed over a length of at least 200 feet from the bow, and water entered at least five compartments. Experts, who were well acquainted with details of the design and were called as witnesses before Lord Mersey's Court, testified that in the calm weather which prevailed the Titanic might have kept afloat after collision if only three of the compartments forward had been flooded ; but she could not bear the simultaneous flooding of five or six compartments. Her bow gradually sank beneath the surface, and at length came the final plunge into the depths of the Atlantic.

The expert evidence now available has shown that no importance need be attached to many conclusions reached

hastily and published before the full facts were known. No proof has been forthcoming of failure of bulkheads when subjected to water-pressure; the suggestion that watertight doors were left open, or opened again after they were first closed, has been disposed of; there is ample proof that the ship did not 'break in two' before she sank. Her loss is fully accounted for by the fact that, as the result of the collision and the high speed at which the ship was steaming, about one-fourth of her length was thrown open to the sea within a few seconds. The watertight subdivision of this portion of the ship was destroyed, and it became only a question of the time which would elapse before she foundered. The fate of the ship was sealed from the moment of impact. The great spaces laid open to the entry of water by the collision must have filled slowly, for the sinkage of the bow was very gradual. As the bow sank, the tops of bulkheads which for a time kept the water back from undamaged compartments were one by one submerged; and, as a consequence, water flowed over and flooded the undamaged compartments in succession, until the reserve of buoyancy of the vessel was overcome. Vessels of smaller dimensions and with less reserve of buoyancy would have sunk in a shorter time had they received the same damage. In this respect the great size of the Titanic was an advantage, because slow sinking gave time to get passengers into the boats and to lower boats safely from the great height above water at which they were carried.

Much has been said since this terrible accident took place in regard to the proof it is supposed to have afforded of the 'fallacy' or 'failure' of watertight subdivision. These allegations indicate a natural reaction from the popular but unfounded belief in the 'unsinkability' of modern passenger steamships which prevailed previously. From what has been said above, it will be obvious that both these extreme opinions must be abandoned. Even in the extraordinary circumstances attending the loss of the Titanic, the watertight subdivision was of enormous value, because she would have sunk rapidly if there had been no such subdivision. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated that the standard of subdivision hitherto accepted—a capability of remaining afloat in moderate weather with two compartments flooded—must be reconsidered, and it is probable that the accident will lead to a revision of

general practice in the mercantile marine, which depends solely on subdivision by means of transverse watertight bulkheads. It is easy to be wise after the event, and it would be unfair to criticise the designers of the Titanic because they adopted arrangements similar to those almost universally accepted for passenger steamships. It may be stated, however, that the evidence now available respecting the character and extent of the damage gives good reason for believing that the Titanic would not have foundered had her forward end been subdivided similarly to the corresponding portions of warships, in which horizontal watertight partitions are formed by decks and platforms—built primarily for purposes of stowage and accommodation—with watertight covers fitted to all hatchways and other openings. Such a system if adopted on passenger ships might somewhat interfere with the ease of access of the crew and firemen to their quarters forward, and possibly might affect the accommodation and freedom of movement of the third-class passengers. It seems now to be admitted, however, that these inconveniences may be overcome and the consideration of increased safety be made paramount, and it has been stated in evidence that, possibly as a result of the loss of the Titanic, watertight decks are to be fitted in the Aquitania, which is building for the Cunard Company.

The gain in safety resulting from the construction of watertight decks or horizontal watertight divisions may be explained briefly. Injuries to the Titanic were inflicted at a considerable depth below the sea surface ; if a watertight deck had existed at a higher level than that at which damage was done, the water entering could only have risen to the height of the under side of that deck, which would have ' locked down ' the water, thus preventing its passage over the tops of transverse bulkheads abaft the injured portion of the vessel. The five or six compartments which were damaged would necessarily have been flooded up to the watertight deck, but the ship would in all probability have remained afloat.

One great lesson to be learnt, therefore, from this disaster is the necessity for more minute watertight subdivision in modern passenger steamships than has been thought sufficient hitherto. The Bulkhead Committee now sitting may be trusted to deal with this matter thoroughly. They will have before them the practice of warship designers, as well as the best examples

taken from mercantile practice. Since the last report on watertight subdivision was made more than twenty years ago, many and important changes have occurred in mercantile steamships, and there has been a considerable approach to an international agreement in regard to regulations affecting the load line and tonnage measurement. It has been stated in the House of Commons by the President of the Board of Trade that negotiations are already in progress between the great maritime powers for the purpose of reaching a common understanding as to future regulations for mercantile shipping and equipment. These facts give promise of the satisfactory treatment of a difficult subject. It is impossible to ignore commercial considerations and to aim exclusively at absolute security of life and property at sea. A ship that was made absolutely secure against the risk of foundering would probably be of little or no use either for passengers or for cargo. Nor can the Government afford to ignore the international aspect of the question. Ocean trade and transport have grown to their present gigantic proportions as the result of private enterprise, and to a large extent independently of Government control. The British mercantile marine represents about one-half of the tonnage of the world, but foreign competition grows keener as time passes. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that both present circumstances and the outlook for the future should be considered calmly and deliberately, before new and stringent regulations are framed and legal sanction given thereto. Obviously, it is most desirable, if it be possible, to adopt a policy which shall be accepted and followed by all great steamship companies, British and foreign, and the opinions of the responsible managers of those companies must be ascertained and taken into consideration. It would be of great advantage if these authorities would confer together as to future procedure, and if they could agree on conditions hereafter to be generally observed, the work of the International Conference would be greatly facilitated. The report of the new Bulkhead Committee, when considered in association with the findings of Lord Mersey's Court, should supply a basis for an international agreement. The initiative in the matter clearly ought to be taken by the British Government, which represents a mercantile marine

vastly exceeding that of any other nation in the numbers of ships and in aggregate tonnage.

Little need be said respecting the boat equipments of the Titanic and other modern passenger steamships, although that subject has occupied the most prominent position in discussions of the disaster and the great loss of life which took place. In this matter history has repeated itself, and did so naturally in the circumstances. Many, if not most, of those who have expressed opinions and made recommendations were obviously unfamiliar with what had happened in the past. The main facts of the case are sufficiently impressive, and there is no need for exaggeration. The Titanic was licensed to carry 3547 persons, passengers and crew: her total boat capacity was sufficient for 1178 persons in moderate weather; consequently for two thirds of the souls she was licensed to carry no boat accommodation was provided. According to the official rules of the Board of Trade the minimum accommodation to be provided in boats was for 962 persons—little more than 27 per cent. of the total number for which the great ship was licensed. The official minimum of accommodation was therefore largely exceeded in the boats actually carried by the Titanic. On her first and fatal voyage rather more than 2200 persons were on board; the boat accommodation was sufficient for more than 53 per cent. of passengers and crew, and reached nearly twice the percentage officially recognised as sufficient when the ship was full. Life-belts were carried for each person on board up to the total number for which the ship was licensed. The conditions of wind and sea at the time of the accident were exceptionally favourable. It was a dead calm, the sea was smooth, and the vessel had no rolling motion or considerable 'list' when the boats were lowered. All the boats were safely set afloat, and there appears to have been no haste, panic, or troublesome excitement when passengers were getting into the boats. Many passengers preferred to remain on board the ship. Including a considerable number of persons who were rescued from the sea, the total of those saved was only 703; some of the boats had comparatively few persons on board in proportion to their size; the total of persons saved was only about 60 per cent. of the total which the boats could have carried if they had been filled up to the extent recognised by official regulations.

Notwithstanding these facts, severe condemnation of the Board of Trade has been pronounced in Parliament and in the Press because of the above mentioned regulations for boats. Endeavours have been made to enforce, in future, the principle that the boats carried by passenger steamships shall provide sufficient accommodation to carry, in moderate weather, the maximum number of persons for which each ship is licensed. The President of the Board of Trade dealt with these matters in a series of speeches and replies to questions asked in the House of Commons, and ably summed up the facts in the course of a formal debate on May 21. Readers desirous of understanding the actual situation and how it came about cannot do better than turn to the official report of that debate. If they do so, they will be convinced that, on this occasion, the Board of Trade was justified; while its accusers were convicted of inaccuracy and incompleteness of statement, and haste in reaching conclusions which did not recognise vital conditions affecting the practical use of boats for life-saving purposes at sea. Calmer consideration has led to recognition of the justice of an opinion again and again expressed during the last thirty years—viz. that the chief security for life and property at sea must always be found in provisions tending to increase the safety of passenger steamships themselves, and that the question of boat equipment, although of importance in itself, is subordinate to efficient watertight subdivision and careful navigation.

The report of the American Senatorial Committee, it is true, makes definite recommendations that sufficient lifeboats shall be provided in future to accommodate every passenger and every member of the crew; and that not less than four members of the crew, skilled in handling boats, shall be assigned to each boat. It is also true that, under the temporary pressure of public opinion, managers of the principal steamship lines at home and abroad have acted on the view that boat accommodation should at once be provided for the maximum number of persons carried in each ship. This action was probably the best that could be taken in the circumstances, but obviously it does not represent a final settlement. The whole subject is now under consideration by the Board of Trade and the Advisory Committee which deals with shipping, and must come before the International Conference. Mr. Buxton was right in saying

that 'all regulations in connexion with shipping must be 'reconsidered carefully in the light of what has happened, and 'they will receive prompt and careful attention.' Lord Mersey's Court of Enquiry has also been invited 'to 'report upon the rules and regulations made under the 'Merchant Shipping Acts . . . and to make any recom-'mendations or suggestions that it may think fit having regard 'to the circumstances of the casualty with a view to promoting 'the safety of vessels and persons at sea.' Lord Mersey and his colleagues have given close attention to this question of boats; and those who have followed the proceedings must have perceived that a conviction had been forced upon the Court by the evidence, which was expressed by the Attorney General (on June 11) as follows: 'It is much 'more important to keep your vessel afloat than to have a 'large number of boats.' The remarks made at the same time by Lord Mersey indicate that the Court concurred in this opinion. The report will place the matter beyond doubt, and its presentation will probably do much to remove mis-apprehensions in regard to the alleged supreme value of boats as a means of saving life.

Existing regulations in regard to life-saving appliances were originated by a Parliamentary Committee appointed by the House of Commons in May 1887 to enquire into laws and regulations regarding boats, lifebuoys and other life-saving gear carried by British merchant ships. The committee numbered amongst its members many men who were eminent in connexion with shipping and seamanship. Lord Charles Beresford was chairman of the committee. Sir Thomas Sutherland, of the P. & O. Company, Sir James Corry and Mr. Donkin were distinguished representatives of British shipowners. Sir Charles Palmer represented shipbuilding as well as shipowning. The committee examined many wit-nesses, including officials of the Board of Trade and experienced officers of the mercantile marine. The evidence given before that committee can still be read with interest and advantage, and it is singular to find how close is the agreement of some of the views put before the committee twenty-five years ago with the views that have been expressed in and out of Parliament since the loss of the Titanic. In their report the committee recorded the opinion that:

'many passenger ships could not without great inconvenience carry so many ordinary boats as would suffice to carry the whole of the passengers and crew with safety in bad weather. Under such circumstances the crew would not be sufficient to man so many boats, nor could they all be got into the water in sufficient time in the event of very rapid foundering.'

Finally, the committee unanimously reported as follows:

'Having regard, however, to the fact that accidents occur probably as often in moderate weather as in bad, and having regard also to the fact that the very cause of the accidents frequently incapacitates many of the boats, and to the further fact that an insufficiency of boats undoubtedly tends to cause panic: we are of opinion that all seagoing passenger ships should be compelled by law to carry such boats and other life-saving apparatus as would in the aggregate best provide for the safety of all on board in moderate weather.'

This recommendation simply laid down a principle. The Parliamentary Committee did not think it desirable to attempt an exact definition of the boats and other life-saving apparatus suitable for various classes of ships, but recommended that this subject 'should be left to the decision of a committee '*ad hoc* of the Board of Trade.' They were of opinion that 'such a committee, if formed, might usefully enquire into many 'appliances for saving life at sea other than those which they '(the Parliamentary Committee) had reported on.' Effect was given to this recommendation in the Merchant Shipping Act of 1888, and in that year a special committee was appointed by the Board of Trade to frame regulations for boats and life-saving appliances. The chairman of this departmental committee was the late Mr. Thomas Ismay (founder of the White Star Line); Mr. Anderson (chairman of the Orient Steamship Company) and a number of gentlemen who were eminent in shipowning or shipbuilding were amongst its members. Rules and tables for boats and life-saving appliances were framed by the committee for various classes of ships, emigrant and passenger steamships being dealt with separately. These rules have been modified in certain particulars from time to time, but the principle has been maintained that 'when ships 'of any class are divided into efficient watertight compartments 'to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade' their boat equipment, rafts, and other life-saving appliances should be proportionately reduced. Mr. Buxton, when describing what

happened, after dwelling on the strong and representative character of the committee, and stating that the standard set up by it had been maintained, added these words :

> ' They (the Committee of 1888) never in their rules and regulations proposed that as regards certain classes of passenger ships there should be sufficient boat accommodation for everyone. I am not concerned to argue whether they were right or wrong. . . . After the disaster that has happened lately it is obvious that these rules and regulations must be radically altered.'

This conclusion will be accepted generally, but much depends upon the method and spirit in which the alterations are considered and carried into effect.

The appalling loss of life which accompanied the foundering of the Titanic must not be allowed to obscure the fact that there has been a remarkable freedom from serious accidents to ocean-going passenger steamships during the period in which the regulations above described have been in force. Taking ten years (1892–1901) no less than 3¼ millions of passengers were carried in British and foreign ships (inward and outward) between the United Kingdom, the United States and British North America. Most of these passengers were carried in British ships, yet the total number of casualties to passengers in British ships during these ten years was only 73. In the next ten years out of six millions of passengers carried only nine were lost. This is a splendid record of safety, and it must be kept in mind, even when we have to mourn the loss of 1500 lives in the Titanic.

The fact that such a terrible loss resulted from a single accident naturally leads to the enquiry : Is it wise to accept in future the enormous risk inevitably accompanying an embarkation of thousands of passengers on board a single ship, and their transport across the ocean under the safe conduct of a single man—the officer of the watch—upon whose discretion and prompt action the safety of the ship and all she carries must depend ? To Lord Mersey and his colleagues has been entrusted the duty of dealing with the causes of the loss of the Titanic, and with serious questions affecting personal responsibility for the navigation and speed of the vessel at the time of collision. On these matters nothing can be said here. It may, however, be proper to remark that, not infrequently, in cases of accident or loss there is a disposition to dwell unduly

on questions connected with the design, construction, propelling apparatus, and equipment of ships. That action may and does sometimes prevent a full recognition of the influence of the 'human element' under whose direction and control the working of all ships must proceed. Commanders of great modern ships, whether built for purposes of war or commerce, have grave responsibilities to bear, and they deserve to have the sympathy as well as the respect of their fellow men in undertaking that onerous duty. Still the question recurs—is it desirable to continue the policy of increasing the size, cost and speed of ships, and the number of human lives carried in individual ships?

Mr. Buxton illustrated some remarkable changes which have taken place in passenger steamships during the last twenty years in the course of the debate to which repeated references have been made. In 1894 the Campania, of 13,000 tons, carried 1850 passengers and crew; in 1899 the Oceanic, of 17,000 tons, carried 2120; in 1904 the Baltic, of 23,800 tons, carried 2400 passengers and crew, but in addition had a large cargo capacity; in 1907 the Mauretania, of 31,900 tons, carried 3147 persons, and (with her sister ship the Lusitania) attained an exceptional speed; in 1912 the Titanic, of 46,000 tons, carried 3547 persons; the Hamburg-American Imperator, of about 50,000 tons (recently launched), is to carry 5200 passengers and crew. In every case the safe navigation of these great vessels must depend ultimately upon the care and skill of the officers in charge. Errors of judgment on their part may involve fatal consequences even to the best designed and best equipped vessels which science and skill can produce. Increase of size, no doubt, favours regularity of passage and the attainment of high speeds in association with relative economy of engine-power and coal consumption. It enables greater comfort and more luxurious accommodation to be provided for those who can afford to pay correspondingly high fares; and in other ways it increases earnings and offers attractions to certain classes of passengers. Even the largest ships yet built or building can be readily manoeuvred and kept under control, and their large dimensions give opportunities to naval architects to secure increased safety against injuries and dangers incidental to collision. On the other hand, difficulties have to be faced in connexion with the provision of

harbour and dock accommodation suitable for these monster ships; and these difficulties, including enormous outlay on civil engineering works, may become so great as to put a stop to further increase in the size of ships.

Fifty years ago, in the earlier period of her service, the Great Eastern was chartered to carry troops across the Atlantic in circumstances of great emergency. The story is told that the responsible authorities, after full consideration of the capabilities of the great ship and the numbers for whom accommodation could have been found on board, decided to send a much less number of men in her; thinking it a wiser policy to limit the risk of loss, notwithstanding her splendid system of subdivision. The incident is worth remembrance even now when that famous vessel has been far surpassed in size.

No one can predict with certainty what may happen in the future. As regards passenger steamers the attitude of passengers themselves towards further increase of dimensions must have a great effect. Hitherto many persons have felt an attraction to travel by the 'biggest' or the 'fastest' ship afloat. For the moment the shock caused by the loss of the Titanic seems to exercise a considerable influence on the public mind; but it will not be surprising if that influence passes away. Whether or not that result follows, one may feel sure that permanent and beneficial effects on the future of shipping and the safety of life at sea will result from the exhaustive investigations of Lord Mersey's Court, from the enquiries now in progress by departmental committees appointed by the Board of Trade, from the action of the responsible authorities of the great steamship companies, and from the proceedings of the International Conference which will soon assemble.

THE CHANGING STATUS OF ORIENTAL WOMEN

1. **China under the Empress Dowager.** By J. O. P. Bland and E. Backhouse. W. Heinemann. 1912.
2. **In Forbidden China.** By Viscount D'Ollone. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
3. **An Account of my Life.** By Her Highness Nawáb Sultán Jahán Begam, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., Ruler of Bhopál. John Murray. 1912.
4. **Japanese Girls and Women.** By Alice Mabel Bacon. Gay and Bird.
5. **The Land of Veiled Women.** By John Foster Fraser. Cassell and Co., Ltd. 1911.
6. **Behind Turkish Lattices.** By Hester D. Jenkins. Chatto and Windus. 1911.
7. **Fifty Years of New Japan.** Compiled by Count Shigénobu Okuma. Smith, Elder, and Co. 1910.
8. **Behind the Veil in Persia and Turkish Arabia.** By M. E. Hume-Griffith. Seeley and Co., Ltd. 1909.

ONE of the most noteworthy and inspiring features of the Orient of our day is the fact that the males are beginning to realise that the modernisation of men unaccompanied by a corresponding improvement in the condition of women is not conducive to a full, rational, well-balanced development of the race. In the best interests of the body politic it is imperative that Orientals must not only revolutionise their military, naval, industrial, commercial, and agricultural methods, but must also impart liberalising knowledge to their women, free them from the incubus of customs that impede their growth, and reorganise family and national life so that it will not hamper the evolution of the female half of the population. All signs unmistakably indicate that the Orient has seen a great light in this respect. From the Far East to the Near East, and everywhere in between these bounds, those who are at the helm of the movements which are rousing Orientals to march forward on the path of progress are giving voice to sentiments that show that they more or less fully realise the important bearing of feminine advancement upon the well-being of the nation. Every year sees their ideas on this subject penetrate to

the classes, and even to the masses. As a consequence, stupendous changes seriously affecting life in general are being brought about in the status of Eastern women. The more wide-awake an Oriental nation is, the more conscious is it that all is not well with its women, the more eagerness does it display in seeking to discover and remove their disabilities.

These statements can easily be verified, for nearly every observer who returns from even a superficial tour of investigation bears testimony to the presence of this phenomenon in the East; while Orientals themselves are directing the world's attention to this development. The literature that is fast springing up dealing with the Orient of our day almost invariably refers to this phase of the subject. Nearly every book of any consequence issued during recent years has called attention to the change that is taking place in the status of Eastern womanhood. In some cases works have been exclusively devoted to this topic, a few of them even being from the pens of Asian women.

In order to obtain a bird's-eye view of the situation it will be necessary to ascertain what views the leaders of Oriental communities entertain on the subject; to contrast their attitude with that of those who lived in the ages that have passed; to investigate what position women occupied in the ancient and medieval Orient, and what position they occupied when Western influence began to act upon Asia; and finally to enquire what effect the impact of the Occident upon the Orient has had in changing woman's position for the better.

That many of the Easterners whose counsels weigh in the affairs of their respective nations keenly realise that it is imperative that the conditions of women's life should be modernised is amply borne out by their speeches and writings. Take, for instance, pronouncements of the Emperor of Japan, who is conceded to have been in a large measure responsible for the wonderful progress his Empire has made during the last half-century, and who continues to exercise a powerful influence over the affairs of Dai Nippon. As early as 1871 his Majesty issued a rescript in which he declared: 'How children grow up 'depends on how the mothers bring them up, and this (female 'education) is a matter of supreme importance.' Count Okuma, one of the 'Elder Statesmen' of Japan, has expressed the opinion that 'the nation would be twice as strong if its women

'were well educated.' The edicts issued by her Majesty Tzu Hsi, the late Dowager Empress of China, during the latter years of her life, fully establish the fact that she appreciated the important position that women fill in modern society. In these decrees she expressed the desire that the women of her empire should cease mutilating their feet, a custom which she recognised was a source of great weakness to her subjects. Her Majesty's attitude may be considered to be reflected in the following aphorism, enunciated in the new Chinese code of education: 'The good education of the citizens of the empire 'depends upon the good education of its women.' Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the man who successfully engineered the recent Chinese revolution, outlining the programme of the new government, on the eve of his departure from the United States of America, to the New York correspondent of 'Le Matin,' declared 'Women will be given a legal status, family life will be 'entirely changed . . . on the day on which the revolutionary 'flag flies over Peking.' The fact that India is governed by an Occidental nation, in itself is enough to show that the authorities in that peninsula are just as eager to provide female education and encourage the progress of women as the leaders in Japan and China. The rulers of the native states and the people at the head of the important communities likewise show that they attach a great deal of importance to the necessity of improving the status of women. His Highness Sayaji Rao III., Gaekwar of Baroda, declared, in a speech in Bombay in March 1910, 'The car of Indian progress cannot get on well if man and 'woman, who represent the two wheels, do not move simul-'taneously and at the same rate of speed.' The Gaekwar of Baroda, though momentarily under a cloud, is not only one of the most progressive native rulers but takes a leading part in all matters of social reform. Sardar Jogendra Singh, one of the highest officials of Patiala, and a distinguished leader amongst the followers of the Gurus, expressed the present-day Sikh thought on this subject when he said, in his presidential address at the Sikh Educational Conference convened early this year, 'Women are, from the constitution of 'things at the most critical period of our lives the educators of 'us all . . . How is a woman who has been brought up in the 'habits of mental bondage, trained to be pleasing, her instru-'ment not reasonable persuasion but caressing and crying, to

'become the guardian of her little ones and builder of their 'character?' Her Highness Nawáb Sultán Jahán Begam, who is the only Moslem woman ruling in her own right and name, has more than once emphatically declared that 'female 'education is the foundation of all national success and 'progress.' Echoes of the sentiments expressed by this remarkable woman are beginning to be heard in other Mohammedan lands.

These statements, in themselves, do not express any new truth. They are merely Oriental echoes of Occidental sentiments. To the uninitiated, therefore, they mean little, and, as there is a monotonous sameness running through all of them, they even may be dismissed as tiresome. However, one only has to compare them with the proverbs and popular maxims current to this day to realise the revolutionary change that has taken place in the attitude of the Oriental male toward the female. The Japanese, for instance, says, 'Though a woman 'has borne you seven children, do not trust her'; and 'A 'woman's tongue is only three inches long, yet it can kill a 'man six feet high.' The Chinaman declares, 'Eighteen 'goddess-like daughters are not equal to one son with a limp'; and 'A young wife should be in her house but a shadow and 'an echo.' The Indian remarks 'A woman's sense always 'lies at the back of her neck (or heel)'—*i.e.* she is wise when it is too late; and 'He is a downright fool who acts according 'to his wife's advice.' The Turk contemptuously exclaims 'Woman's hair is long, but her wit is short'; shows his lack of confidence in her integrity by declaring 'The dog is 'faithful, woman never'; and expresses his opinion in regard to the propriety of females taking an interest in anything beyond pots and pans by saying 'With her hands full of 'dough she is mixed up with (interferes with) the business of 'a man.' Maxims of this character are worth more than many volumes of erudite essays in giving a true insight into the old-time Oriental views of the nature and position of women.

If these proverbs are regarded as revealing only the mind of the lower social stratum, and not that of the better classes, the aphorisms of the philosophers show that woman was considered also by the thinkers of old to be of no great importance in the scheme of national destiny. Ekkén Kaibara,

whose principles are embodied in the 'Onna Daigaku,' or 'Greater Learning for Women,' declared, in connexion with the mother's right to superintend the education of her children, 'Such is the stupidity of . . . (woman) . . . that it is in-'cumbent on her, in every particular, to distrust herself and 'obey her husband'; while Confucius laid down the dogma 'It is a law of nature that woman should be kept under the 'control of man, and not allowed any will of her own.'

In referring to the status of Oriental women of the past, one enters an extremely contentious phase of the subject. During the medieval, and even the earlier centuries, there were many Eastern women who exceeded the measure of the low opinion of females as expressed by the proverbs and texts that have been quoted, and who were respected and honoured by their contemporaries; indeed, some of them are worshipped even to-day. The annals of every Oriental land furnish a number of illustrious examples.

How are we to reconcile the respect in which the names of these famous females are held to this day with the contemptuous male attitude toward women generally, which is betrayed by the popular maxims?

It may be argued that these brilliant women constitute the exceptions which prove the rule, and that they were such unusually exalted personages that their personalities stood out in bold relief against the dull background formed by the masses of ignorant women of their time, whose status was low because their attainments were so limited. It likewise may be pointed out that the deeds of these renowned women have been crowned by time with a golden halo of romance. The force of this criticism is altogether lost on Orientals, who argue from these instances that their forbears treated females with great respect and consideration. A voluminous literature is growing up to establish the claim that in pre-medieval days, at least, woman was not referred to with contempt.

These claims are interesting, inasmuch as they show that those who advance them realise the important part woman plays in the destiny of a nation. They have more than mere academic value, because Eastern peoples concentrate their attention upon the past, and, therefore, the easiest way to get them to move forward is to prove to them that the change which is advocated is not new—indeed, that it merely means

throwing off the accretions of the dark ages and returning to the approved ancient customs. It is very hard to verify statements of this kind pertaining to the status of women in the legendary days, because of the meagreness of authentic historical data. All that can be done in the circumstance is to form more or less crude surmises from the traditions that have been handed down. This point being of relatively small importance for the development of our theme, we will content ourselves with the mere statement that, in the light of growing knowledge based on the research work of savants, some of these claims can be substantiated, and go on to the consideration of the position accorded Oriental women by the non-Christian Eastern religions.

Almost without exception the Christian missionaries attribute the disabilities under which the women of the Orient labour to the low ideals of Eastern creeds. Such charges necessarily offend the susceptibilities of the Easterners, who categorically deny them and seek to show that their religions give an ideal position to women. It is hard to harmonise these counter-claims. As a rule those who hurl accusations and those who offer explanations, err from lack of moderation, because, generally, they are enthusiasts—indeed, the worst of their ilk—religious zealots. One is inclined to accept the opinions of the native apologists rather than those of the missionaries, since it would appear that the former necessarily must know more about the subject than foreigners. But the fact that the Eastern peoples are peculiarly sensitive, and even more prone than Occidentals to hide their family skeletons in dark closets, must compel us to take *cum grano salis* what they say about the beneficence of their institutions. The Westerner is likely to form misconceptions owing to the difference that exists between the feminine customs of the Orient and the Occident, and owing to the fact that few religious enthusiasts are able to put aside their point of view when examining and discussing institutions vastly dissimilar to those to which they are accustomed; on the whole they are often unreliable authorities. Of late years, however, Western scholars, uninfluenced by religious bias, have taken up the study of Eastern creeds in a scientific spirit, while some Orientals have begun to delve into their classics in a purely unprejudiced manner. As a result of this research we may say that it

appears to be unjust to consider that all the principal religions of the East look upon women with contempt. In view of the fact that neither Buddhism nor Confucianism are exercising a potent influence upon the Japanese and Chinese of the new school, and especially since a book published under the authority of the Japanese Government ('Education in Japan') tacitly admits that 'by the two influences of Chinese Confucianism and 'Indian Buddhism, women were reduced to a condition of sub-'jection,' it will not be necessary for our purpose to investigate the attitude of these religions toward women, though we must state that some followers of Confucius and Buddha condemn this position as being untenable. But as Hinduism and Mohammedanism are still active factors in the life of those who profess these religions, it will be worth while to find out what status they accord to women.

Hinduism of the Vedic type is now conceded to treat woman as *Ardhangini*—the equal half—of man. Upon marriage her individuality merges with that of her husband and the two form a single entity. This does not, however, imply that she is inferior to her life-partner in the sense that she is completely lost in him. He, like her, becomes only a part of a single social entity. Both are required conjointly to perform sacrifices, and at the time of the daughter's marriage, she must be given away by both parents, and not by one only. Woman's property rights are recognised, and secured to her by law and custom. She has claims on her father, brothers, and sons for suitable maintenance, and, though a male child may be disinherited by his father, still a son is bound to maintain his mother so long as she lives in a manner befitting the dignity of the family; while a Hindu's sister can claim maintenance, marriage expenses, and presents on every ceremonial occasion, and even her children have well-defined claims on him, all of which he is bound to respect. He cannot evade them, even if he might wish to do so, for society is so constituted that on pain of excommunication it can compel any individual to fulfil such obligations. Authorities are not unanimous in their views about the attitude of ancient Hindu religious law-givers toward early marriage and enforced widowhood. One faction contends that both the spirit and the letter of the Vedas are against these institutions, and even declares that divorce is permissible in certain circumstances;

while the other claims exactly the opposite to be true. Polygamy is said to be sanctioned only in case the wife does not give birth to a male heir, and is said to imply not lack of regard for women but desire for sons, who in India, as in other Eastern lands, are necessary for religious observances.

According to Islám, pure and undefiled, the girl remains under her parental roof as long as she is unmarried, and is subject to the control of her father or his representative until she reaches her majority, at which time she becomes vested by law with every right which Mohammedanism gives her as an independent human being. On the decease of her parents she shares in their property with her brothers, though the proportion is slightly in favour of the males. When she is of age, a girl cannot be married against her will, 'even by the 'Sultan.' The Moslem woman does not lose her individuality after her marriage, but retains her name and all rights to her own property, which she is permitted to manage in any way she may see fit, and may dispose of as she pleases, without reference to her husband. All her earnings belong to herself. She can sue her debtors in a court of law, in her own name, without joining a next friend. The husband is forced to make an ante-nuptial settlement on his wife, and if he fails to do so the law grants her one in accordance with his position in society. Marriage under the Islamic code is a civil act, and a wife is protected from ill-treatment at the hands of a cruel spouse, and has a right to demand a divorce if she wishes to escape from unhappy wedlock. She is legally entitled to the custody of her sons until they are old enough to be trusted to a tutor, and her authority over her daughters continues until they marry or become of legal age. A woman is entitled to become a judge or a rector of a university.

We may or may not admit the correctness of these views pertaining to the feminine status decreed by the various religions, but we cannot disagree about the position that woman occupied at the time when Western influence began to potently impel the Easterners to change their ways of life and modes of thought. History has set its seal upon the latter point, and all authorities agree that woman, at that time, was not given the place in society (theoretically) accorded her by the Asian creeds, and was not dealt with by males as the famous women of the past must have been treated.

In Japan, about the time when the visit of Commodore Perry, in 1853, opened up Dai Nippon to the world at large, woman lived under the dominance of a militarism which placed man far above her, and which, unlike the feudalism of the Occident, knew naught about chivalry toward the fair sex. Every woman's life was subject to 'the three obediences,' which enjoined submission to parents in early years, to the mother-in-law and husband in later life and to the son in widowhood. The girls of the higher classes were taught barely to read and write and to do simple sums in arithmetic. They also learned the decorative arrangement of flowers, the proper way to serve tea, and acquired a smattering of painting and verse-making; and had to go through a very rigid training in morals so that they would make polite and obedient wives and daughters-in-law. These educational advantages did not lead very far, but even they were not extended to girls of the poorer classes, who only learned to keep house and make themselves useful in field or workshop. Every maid was married at an early age (usually when about fifteen) to a young man selected by her parents, the life-partners being given the merest nominal voice in selecting each other. On being wedded she did not become the mistress of her own separate household, but went to live with the bridegroom's parents, whose authority over her was supreme, being, as a matter of fact, superior even to that of her husband. She was allowed to offer no objection, and did not dream of demurring, if her husband brought a courtesan to live in the same house with her, the concubine's children being considered legitimate, and the wife being expected to treat such issue with the affection of a mother. Marriage was considered a purely secular affair, no religious ceremony being performed, and the civil contract had no permanency attached to it. The wife was liable to be divorced on the grounds of sterility, lewdness, disobedience to her parents-in-law, loquacity, larceny, jealousy, and disease; and divorce was obtainable, by either party, without recourse to law, and without the necessary consent of the other. In practice this meant that the man could much more easily get rid of a wife of whom he was tired than the woman could free herself from a bad husband, since custom required the wife to obtain her husband's consent before she could obtain a separation from him. Inasmuch as the children belonged to the father, many mothers,

at least those belonging to the higher classes, would put up with an undesirable husband rather than be parted from their little ones. In practice divorce was common, especially amongst the lower and middle classes. Noblemen generally avoided divorce, partly from fear of causing scandal and partly because their wives, as a rule, belonged to powerful families, and bitter, sanguinary feuds might be caused if they were summarily sent back to their parents. Abstention from divorce did not, however, make much difference to the men, for they were not forced to keep up conjugal relations with their unloved wives, and could console themselves with concubines. The husband was the sole owner of the family property and could dispose of it without giving any account of his actions to his wife. In a few exceptional cases, however, the man entered his wife's family (of which she was allowed to be the head in default of a male heir to her father's property). In that case the woman's position was vastly improved. As the responsible ruler of the home, she was the owner of the family property, and the sole right of disposal was vested in her. The sexes lived their lives quite apart, the female remaining in seclusion and not being visited by males, with the exception of very near relatives. Amongst the rich and respectable classes there was practically no marriage after widowhood.

The women of the lower social ranks fared somewhat better than did their more prosperous sisters, poverty placing them on a more equal footing with man. It was but natural that the wife of an artisan, a small trader, or a peasant, who was forced to bear her share of the burden of bread-winning, should have comparatively more liberty than the woman who, at best, was but a petted doll. Indeed if the poor man's wife happened to have more business ability than her lord and master, she took upon herself the responsibility of providing the family income, and became the governing head of the household.

In China during the greater part of the nineteenth century, when the Chinese had not yet felt the thrill of new life surging through their veins, women were subject to much the same condition as those existing in Nippon in the pre-*Meiji* era. They were further subject to one purely Chinese custom which cruelly affected the Chinese (not the Manchu) woman's life, viz. foot-binding—an institution which subjected her, from infancy to death, to excruciating pain and great disability, for by tight

bandaging while the bones were still pliable, the foot was reduced until it was not much larger than a big toe, leaving the victim of the fashion absolutely unable to walk, or, at best, able only to painfully and slowly hobble about. This thousand-year-old fashion claimed as its devotees not only those women whose one rôle in life was to look attractive to their husbands, who furnished them servants and slaves to wait on them and carry them about, pick-a-back or in a palanquin, but also those who were forced to take an active part in maintaining the home.

In India, during the period when British rule was being consolidated, the Hindu woman's life in many ways was similar to that of her sister in China and in Japan. So far as seclusion went, at least in Northern India, she was placed in even a worse position than the women of those countries, the segregation of the sexes being more strictly enforced in Upper Hindustan. The Hindu woman, being more religious by temperament than the women of the Far East, though not much better off in point of literacy, was better versed in sacred lore. Marriage was solemnised (though in some cases not consummated) earlier in India than in China and Japan, and though polygamy was indulged in by a few—chiefly under the pretext of lack of male issue—there was no divorce for man or woman, and no marriage for the widow, who sometimes even performed *sati* (suttee), sacrificing herself, willingly or under compulsion, on the funeral pyre of her dead husband. The Hindu wife entered a much larger household than did the girl in China or Japan, for India then had even bigger 'joint families' than it has now. In the matter of property rights, she had better advantages than the women of the Far East, though not many women of any Oriental country, in the middle of the nineteenth century, were capable or desirous of enforcing any legal rights they possessed.

The Mohammedan women of India, as, indeed, of the rest of the Islamic world, abided in similar restricted conditions. Their seclusion was far more rigorous than that of the Hindu ladies. In regard to early marriage, having little or no voice in the selection of the husband, and also in respect to education, they were about on a par with the rest of Asian womanhood. However, in the matter of property rights, the Mohammedan woman had a better status than either her Eastern or Western sisters of the same period. In the matter of divorce, too,

though the Mohammedan woman did not possess facilities equal in every respect to those enjoyed by the male, she was favoured above other Oriental women.

In this survey, only general conditions have been discussed. No mention has been made of the comparatively small communities of Oriental women who enjoy an exceptional status. The females of the Chinese tribe of Lolos are included in this latter category. These women, like the Manchus, do not bind their feet, and unlike them, do not live segregated from the males. Viscount D'Ollone, in his ' Forbidden China,' gives interesting glimpses of the free and easy life enjoyed by these women. The woman of Tibet and contiguous regions also figures in this list. Lady Jenkins, in her superbly illustrated book ' Sport and Travel in Both Tibets,' probably more than any other writer presents pen pictures of the life of women in the land of the Lamas that must delight the heart of all feminists. The Burmese woman likewise leads a gay and picturesque existence distinguished by great economic freedom, the man frequently acting the drone and living on the earnings of his capable wife, or even wives, for these delightfully charming women never hamper their husbands by compelling them to be monogamous, thus showing a more generous spirit than that displayed by most male bread-winners, who refuse to permit their wives to practise polyandry. But among certain tribes of the Malabar coast, and in forest and hill districts in other parts of Hindustan, the women are permitted to indulge in a plurality of husbands. In Travancore, property, from the crown down, descends in the female line, and woman does pretty much as she pleases, without reference to any man's whims, desires, or commands. The status occupied by females in these communities is, however, exceptional, and in no way affects the general position of Oriental womanhood.

To sum up : Broadly speaking, the Eastern woman, before the West began actively to influence the Orient, lived quite apart from the males, in a world of her own, unillumined by the light of liberal knowledge, remaining throughout her whole life an adolescent who required to be protected and provided for by man, whom, in return, she served either as a housekeeper and fellow-helper, or merely as a sort of super-*demi-mondaine*, or both, and whom she worshipped as a superior being, even as a god. The men looked upon women as creatures ordained by the

Almighty to serve and amuse them, and took care of them and treated them as if they were little children. There is no evidence to sustain the oft-preferred charge that Oriental men treated women brutally. But there can be no question of the fact that the general relations existing between the sexes were not perfectly equal. This is amply proved by the facts that the Eastern man enjoyed the privilege of absolute divorce, whereas the woman either had no such right, or was allowed inferior advantages in this respect; that he was permitted to practice polygamy while she was denied the right to indulge in polyandry; and that the widow was compelled to remain unwedded to the end of her days, even when the marriage had not been consummated, while the widower, though he might have one foot in the grave, was free to marry again. A less sacrificing type of femininity would have rebelled against such iniquitous inequality—a revolt which would have adjusted matters, making the male less selfish, the female less submissive. But at the time of which we are writing, no such aggressive action could have suggested itself to the women of any Eastern land. Indeed, the relations between the sexes were such that full reciprocity was out of the question. The following tale from 'Between the Twilights,' by Miss C. Sorabji, who, on account of her official position as the legal adviser of *purdanasheen* * ladies, has had unrivalled opportunities for studying and understanding the hidden life of the women of India, and who always writes truthfully and sympathetically of her sisters, throws light on this point:

'I remember a poor little woman who had been induced by some modern-minded friend to resent the drunken belabourings of her husband . . . She ran away to the protection of a relative, and all the Zenana held up hands of horror, not at the beating, but at her resentment of it. "What! Did she not know that Hindu wives belonged to their husbands, to be done with as they would? Would she not give her body to be burned at his desire? Why not then give it to be beaten at his desire?" And no reasoning could convince them of a difference.'

* Many words employed by various Eastern peoples for wife and woman presuppose the condition of seclusion. The Japanese term *okusama* literally is 'the mistress of the inside.' The Hindustani and Persian *purdanashin* means 'sitting behind the curtain'; the Arabian *harmatah* or *hurma* and the Turkish *harem*, all are derived from the Arabic *harm* which refers to the portion of the house forbidden to men.

The situation, as it then existed, was that, of the two sexes, one was too masterful, too thoughtless, too selfish (rather than wantonly cruel); the other too submissive, too considerate, too unselfish (rather than abjectly slavish).

At this stage the positive pole of the West and the negative pole of the East came in contact, and an intellectual electric current began to stimulate to activity the people who had been somnolent for hundreds of years. The Occidentals themselves had recently gone through the process of awakening in respect to the rights of women; indeed, they were still experiencing the throes of the process. They, too, had been in the habit of referring contemptuously to women; but with the dawn of the new era they had seen the folly of treating the female as if she belonged to an inferior order. They even had recognised the futility of attempting to keep woman on the mock pedestal on which knight-errantry had set her. The eighteenth, and that portion of the nineteenth century which had sped by, had seen the Occidental consciousness indelibly impressed with the importance of woman's rôle on the stage of life. As a consequence of all this, female education had received a great impetus; the ideas about the sphere and capabilities of woman had completely changed; and she had commenced to emerge from the semi-seclusion in which she had lived during the dark ages. What wonder, then, that the influence of the West on the East should, from the very earliest stages, have tended to improve the position of women in the Orient.

Soon after the Emperor of Japan came into his own, a new era began to dawn for Nipponese women. Several feudal barons, who not long before had been shorn of their great powers, were the first to set out on a crusade to provide education modelled, half along old-fashioned, half along Western, lines, and between 1870 and 1872 several schools were established exclusively for females. In 1871 the Government struck the first important note, when the ruler issued a rescript calling attention to the lack of educational facilities for women. Immediately afterwards a Department of Education was established by the Imperial Government. A formal code was drawn up in 1872 providing for the compulsory education of both males and females, who must enter school at the age of six and study for at least four (now six) years. The triumph of female education is apparent from the fact that in 1909–10 there were 3,461,442

female students as against 3,857,957 males. So rapid has been the spread of literacy amongst the women of Japan that the feminine publications, of which there exist a large number and variety, from political sheets to housekeeping periodicals, command 'a larger circulation than any other journals and 'magazines published in Japan.' * This is a marvellous record when we realise that forty years ago Nipponese women were, almost without exception, quite illiterate.

Baron Kikuchi, in his useful book 'Japanese Education,' frankly points out that the national aim in giving education to girls is to produce 'good mothers and wives.' This justly sums up the educational policy of Nippon, and as a natural consequence comparatively few females have abandoned their traditional sphere in order to engage in business. The only profession that has been really much patronised by them is teaching. Excellent facilities are provided for the girls of Japan to qualify themselves in pedagogy; and the way they are joining the ranks of teachers, mostly primary, shows that they are making good use of their opportunities. The other principal profession which women have invaded is medicine, 180 of them, according to the latest available statistics, being in practice. They also are taking up nursing, Red Cross work being a great favourite with females of the middle and higher classes. Numerous commercial and technical schools to-day prepare girls for business. Some have wedged their way into commercial offices as book-keepers, cashiers, and stenographers, while a few are to be found in the Government railway, telegraph, and telephone services as clerks and operators, and in newspaper offices acting as reporters and editors. Modern conditions have tended to raise the marriage age to twenty or twenty-five, and gradually economic necessity is pushing the women of the middle classes into the business world, though as yet this tendency has not become very strong. The present-day Japanese women of the lower classes, as of yore, are helping their husbands in the fields, tea gardens, silk farms, fisheries, potteries, etc. The introduction of large numbers of female operatives in factories and mills has been an innovation of recent years.

In times of national crisis Japan has learned the value of

* Education in Japan, part vii. p. 24.

educated women. They showed great patriotism and made many sacrifices during the Chino-Japanese war of 1894 and the Russo-Japanese war of 1904. The chatty and valuable diary of Baroness Albert d'Anethan, 'Fourteen Years of Diplomatic 'Life in Japan,' and the interesting reminiscences of Lady Lawson, in her 'Highways and Homes of Japan,' show how the Japanese women, from the Empress down to the lowliest, worked to aid and comfort the soldiers in the field. The educated women are increasingly becoming interested in philanthropic work. The largest society that has been formed by them is the Ladies' Patriotic Association, including women from the very highest to the very lowest ranks in life, with scores of branches scattered throughout the Empire, boasting of 784,000 members.

Since the Restoration some noteworthy laws have been made in order to give woman a better status. In 1875 an imperial decree was promulgated ordaining practically the same divorce facilities for women as those enjoyed by men. Under the new code there are two kinds of divorce, one that is obtained by mutual consent, and the other judicial, the wife being allowed to bring an action against her husband without reference to his wishes in the matter. In the former, the right to the children is still vested with the father, unless the mother is able to force upon him a stipulation that they be given to her: but in a judicial divorce the judge may, 'in the interests of the 'children, take them away from the father and assign them 'to the care of some other person.' Whereas under the old system one marriage out of three resulted in a separation, now the percentage is only one in five. The Japanese law affecting woman has also been altered so that to-day, so long as she remains unmarried or a widow, she may adopt children, buy or dispose of property, and enter into contracts, as if she were a man. If married she must obtain her husband's consent before doing anything that may affect their joint life, although such acts if committed without her husband's permission are not necessarily void, but only provisionally so if he chooses to annul them by his veto. Even in the latter instance, if she can prove that she is so placed that she cannot secure her husband's approval of such acts, or if the interests of the two are conflicting, she may perform them without gaining his formal permission to do so, and they are valid. The legal sanction has

been withdrawn from concubinage, and the legitimacy of children of such unions is questionable. As yet, however, the laws are ahead of society, and women do not take full advantage of the legal protection that has been provided to safeguard their interests. But these criticisms are becoming less and less correct, since education is awakening woman to a sense of her legal rights, and instilling in her the determination to enjoy them to the fullest possible extent.

In the wake of modern education, customs are being transformed. For instance, some of the girls are beginning to wish for and actually exercise more than mere 'nominal' selection in the choice of their husbands. A change is slowly taking place in the marriage ceremony, its purely social observance now being, in some cases, supplemented with a religious ceremony.

Though of late years the advanced Japanese women have banded together to agitate for political rights, their efforts have not been crowned with much success. As yet women cannot vote at the national parliamentary elections. Some elementary suffrage privileges have been given them, and they are permitted to ballot, under special conditions, for members of the city, town, and village assemblies, and also for members of the Chamber of Commerce, the latter a legally constituted body in Nippon.

China's record of progress falls far below that of Japan: nevertheless it is unquestionable that the Chinese woman's state in many respects has been bettered by the introduction of Western ideas. The first girls' school organised along Occidental lines ever established in China owed its origin to missionary enterprise, having been started at Ningpo in 1844, by Miss Aldersey, to teach the rudiments of the three R's and needlework. During the next fifty years missionaries opened schools for girls at various points in China. The first purely native effort to provide modern education for females has been traced back to 1897, when a society was formed by some of the officials and merchants of Shanghai for the purpose of starting an institution of learning. This was opened the following June with an enrolment of sixteen girls; but the Dowager Empress, fearing that it would simply serve the ends of the revolutionists, ordered it to be closed in less than two years. The movement, however, had gained too much impetus to

be thus arrested, and public-spirited Chinese took it upon themselves to open and conduct schools for girls in the Treaty Ports and other cities. Several progressive viceroys also established similar institutions. But great progress was not possible until, about the middle of the decade that has just passed, Tzu Hsi changed her attitude toward female education. How the humiliation incidental to the Boxer troubles made her Majesty alter her mind on this as well as many other subjects is vividly described in 'China Under the Empress 'Dowager' by J. O. P. Bland and E. Backhouse. After this transformation, the cause gained great momentum. In 1906 a commission was sent abroad to investigate conditions. Regulations for establishing girls' primary and normal schools throughout the empire, and recognising and aiding private academies, were framed and passed by the 'Old Buddha,' who even sanctioned the employment of foreign lady teachers. She ordered that the government schools be provided with large, well-constructed buildings, supplied with every possible requirement that money could buy for imparting modern education; and that salaries much larger than those received by instructors in missionary schools be paid the teachers. For evasive China, these mandates were carried out quite faithfully. But even with all these advantages in its favour, it has been difficult for female education to make much headway on account of lack of competent teachers—a deficiency which China of late years has been trying hard to fill by opening normal schools and sending girls to Japan, America, and Europe, for pedagogic training. Despite all the disadvantages it has had to encounter, the movement is steadily progressing. In the province of Chi-li, according to M. H. Borel in 'The New China,' in 1907 there were no fewer than 121 girls' schools with fifty-three teachers and 2625 pupils, and he relates that the rush to these institutions was so furious that now it is hard to estimate how many girls are receiving instruction in that section alone, much less in the whole country. However, as yet not one in a thousand Chinese women, as estimated by Professor Ross, is literate.

One result of female education has been the springing up of a number of periodicals entirely devoted to feminine interests, many cities now having such newspapers and magazines. Though very few Chinese women have yet

entered professions, they no longer lead a secluded life, while here and there girls are demanding the right to select their own husbands, some intrepid ones even banding themselves together as 'girls who intend to follow their own will,' and organising what the 'Literary Digest,' of New York, has facetiously described as 'marriage strikes' to resist the thrusting of undesirable spouses upon them by their parents.

During the recent revolution some of the women of China have shown that they can be as patriotic as the women of Japan. On the establishment of the new government the radical women organised an agitation to secure votes—a demand which, in view of the illiteracy prevailing amongst them (and eke amongst the males) has been indefinitely shelved.

Notable progress has been made in abolishing foot-binding. A large number of women have removed the bandages that kept them slaves, and natural feet are growing fashionable. Mrs. Archibald Little,* and also the missionaries, wielded considerable influence in awakening the Chinese consciousness in this matter. Native women, in many places, now have founded associations to urge this, as well as other feminine reforms.

The advancement of women in India dates from the day when peace was guaranteed to Hindustan by the establishment of British rule. But the peculiar formation of Indian society, and the hyper-sensitiveness of the people in regard to permitting outsiders to meddle with their established customs, have made the pace of progress so slow as to be almost imperceptible. As in China, modern schools for girls were first started by the missionaries. The government, soon after its consolidation, set out to supplement the Christian institutions. Throughout the nineteenth and the present century, both official and missionary schools for girls have been multiplied, and during the last fifty years educated Indians have commenced to add their quota to the list. Withal, literacy amongst females has made such small progress that in the year of grace 1910, only eleven in one thousand women could read and write; and

---

* The last chapters of Mrs. Little's book, 'In the Land of the Blue Gown,' dealing with this subject, give an excellent idea of how nobly this indefatigable Englishwoman carried on the crusade to 'put the Chinese women on their feet.'

in 1910–11 the total number of females receiving instruction was 793,646. This, out of a total of no less than 315,000,000 souls, of whom about half are women! We may find consolation in the statement personally made to the present writer by the head of one of the largest administrative divisions of India, that the increase in the percentage of girls joining schools is much larger than the similar increase amongst boys.

Some legislation in the interest of women has been passed by the British, the most notable being the statutes abolishing *sati* and female infanticide, the act legalising widow remarriage, and the law permitting civil marriage in the case of those Indians who are willing to forswear their religion. The last, on the face of it, is but a half-measure, but a recent bill brought forward by an Indian member of the Supreme Legislative Council, seeking to correct its defects, was defeated, mainly because the government considered it to be too much ahead of social progress. *Sati* and female infanticide have been stopped; but the other two acts have not been taken much advantage of.

Judging from platform talk and the tone of the native press, it might be thought that great social advancement had taken place. But the facts do not warrant such a roseate conclusion. As yet the Indian conscience has not been deeply enough quickened to materialise words into reform. However, as preaching precedes practice, the history of the propaganda for the uplifting of women may be outlined. Raja Rama Mohan Roy (1774–1833), the founder of the Brahmo Somáj, was the first Indian to take up the cause of women. His help in the passing of the *sati* act is acknowledged. Pandit Iswara Chandra Vidyasagar (1820–1891), another Bengali, followed this reformer, and devoted his energies to controverting the popular belief that the Hindu Scriptures enforced widowhood. In the Punjab, Maharishi Dayanand Sarasvati (1824–1883), the founder of the Arya Somáj, carried on a similar agitation, and his propaganda stirred the Sikhs of the same province to realise that their women were in a benighted condition. The influence of the Arya Somáj spread to the contiguous United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (then the North-west Provinces) and to the Bombay Presidency, the latter receiving an impulse, even to a greater extent, from the Brahmo Somáj under the

leadership of Keshab Chunder Sen. Dr. Bhandarkar, the late Justice Ranadé, and Sir Narayan Chandravarkar, took a lead in the movement. In Madras, the pioneer work was done by Dewan Bahadur Ragunath Rao and Rao Bahadur K. Veerasalingan Pantalu. For over twenty years the social reformers have been meeting annually and advocating the advancement of women. The subject is constantly kept to the fore by reform papers which now exist in all parts of the country, headed by the one under the control of Mr. K. Nataranjan, B.A., a courageous editor. Some feminine periodicals, a few edited by women, also exist and are working toward the same end. Until recently, the Mohammedans of India did not even indulge in talk about bettering the status of their women, and up till now they have held themselves aloof from the Congress. But more and more they are realising that in point of the seclusion of women, the segregation of the sexes, and feminine illiteracy, they are much more conservative than the Hindus. Her Highness the Begam of Bhopál, amongst many other Indian Moslems, has lately been interesting herself in providing modern education for her female co-religionists. His Highness the Aga Khan, with the aid of young Mussulmans, has set out to demolish the *purdah* system; and the Right Honourable Syed Amir Ali is attempting to convince his co-religionists that polygamy, in this day and age, is nothing short of adultery. Advanced Indian females of all races and creeds have joined in pushing the propaganda of feminine progress, the most notable amongst them being Pandita Ramabai, whose work has benefited thousands of widows and orphans. To read of her history and work as described by her friend Helen S. Dyer, in 'Pandita Ramabai, the Story of her 'Life,' is to feel that this unique woman would have been canonised by the Hindus if she had not been converted to Christianity. The activity displayed by the Hindus and Moslems in no small measure is due to the indirect influence of the Christian missionaries, a fact that is acknowledged by frank native reformers. The direct efforts of the foreign teachers, it hardly need be added, are also of great beneficence. The work which the Salvation Army alone is doing for feminine advancement, is invaluable. The native Christian community in India, as elsewhere in the Orient, possesses the largest percentage of literate women. With the exception of the

Indian Christians, few women of Hindustan have entered professions.

In other oriental countries where Islam is predominant, the barnacles of the dark ages have fastened themselves so firmly upon social habits that female progress is very hard to achieve. No reliable statistics are available for Persia, but it is well established that missionary schools are being supplemented by institutions conducted by private Persians and by the government for the benefit of girls and young women. Practically nothing has been accomplished in the way of banishing seclusion and polygamy, though some members of the female sex have displayed considerable patriotism, and even a mild desire for political careers. It may be noted that recently a member of the Mejlis went so far as to advocate ' votes for women,' only to be laughed at by his colleagues. Indeed, so little progress has been registered in that country that Professor A. V. W. Jackson, a reliable authority on Persia, in his ' From Constantinople to ' the Home of Omar,' does not make a single hopeful remark on the subject. In the same way Mrs. Hume Griffith, in the sympathetic and clear-cut delineation of female conditions in Western Asia which she gives in ' Behind the Veil in Persia and ' Turkish Arabia,' has little to say of the advancement of women in either of the two countries of which she writes. In Egypt there is more progress, at any rate in education, and each year sees the number of girls' schools and colleges steadily increase. Lord Kitchener in his report on Egypt for the year 1911 says :

' There is probably nothing more remarkable in the social history of Egypt during the last dozen years than the growth of opinion among all classes of Egyptians in favour of the education of their daughters. The girls' schools belonging to the Ministry of Education are crowded, and to meet the growing demand sites have been acquired and fresh schools are to be constructed, one at Alexandria and two in Cairo. Very many applications for admission have, however, to be refused. The Provincial Councils have during the past year done something to remedy this deficiency. Girls' schools have been opened by the Councils in five Mudirias, and in other cases private girls' schools have been taken over.'

No appreciable progress in the treatment of women can be traced in the northern belt of Africa, which, though so near to Europe, yet is a part of the Orient. There is no reason to believe that the women of Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco are

being modernised to any appreciable extent. In Turkey, the Nearest East, the situation is more hopeful. Ambitious Turkish maidens in Constantinople are provided with facilities for the highest education by a missionary enterprise, the American College for Girls. The Young Turks are slowly adding to the girls' schools and bettering their equipment, and the number of female students is growing —though no reliable statistics are available. Mild reforms regarding the seclusion of women, and the segregation of the sexes, are being quietly advanced, and girls are gradually coming to exercise more than a nominal choice of their future husbands. A small percentage of educated women are taking to teaching, nursing, journalism, and authorship. It is only fair to state distinctly that the fervid hopes entertained for the immediate emancipation of women by the Young Turks have not been fulfilled, feminine progress making slow headway. Dr. Jenkins, in 'Behind Turkish Lattices,' gives charming glimpses of the life led by advanced Turkish women, contrasting it with the rather dull existence of their uneducated sisters, and affords the reader a very fair idea of conditions as they actually exist to-day in the Sultan's domains.

In the above rapid and cursory survey of the past and present conditions of Oriental women, enough has been said to show that the status of the Eastern woman has been in the crucible for at least fifty years, and that it has more or less changed everywhere in the East. But it would not be right to leave too optimistic an impression. The prejudices which feminism still has to combat in the Orient are immense. How predominant the reactionary forces are even in a country like Japan, is graphically depicted by the Baroness d'Anethan on page 497 of her diary :

'I was discussing this important question of the altered position of the modern woman of Japan with a young and most advanced Japanese, and I was surprised to hear this gentleman, who had spent much of his life abroad, and who, I thought, would have been the last to express such an opinion, announce in emphatic terms that when he chose a wife it would certainly not be what he called a "high-collar" girl, but one who was—like the olden days—gentle and submissive and obedient to her husband, coupled with a thorough knowledge of the domestic duties and of household management according to the altered circumstances of the day. . . . So much for the point of view of the marriageable man of New

Japan. Contrary as it is to what one would expect of the youth of this go-ahead nation, most with whom I have talked on the subject have expressed the same opinion.'

One peep may be had into the conservative psychology of the Oriental woman herself. We will quote from the latest pronouncement made on the subject of veils and feminine emancipation by the Begam of Bhopál, because in many ways she is a progressive woman, and also because she recently issued a volume in which she bared her soul (and face, too, for that matter, for her photograph is reproduced in it), pointing out, in the course of the book, that man's selfishness keeps woman ignorant. Giving her mature reflections on her recent European tour, her Highness said :

'. . . . I do not much care for the liberty that oversteps the limit of propriety. I am sure that our *purdanashin* ladies . . . have no idea of the extent of the liberty of the women of Europe. . . . I have no hesitation in saying that that liberty is utterly unsuited to the conditions of this country, and particularly in the case of Mohammedans. . . . We must act on the precious saying of our Prophet ". . . Take only that which is clean . . ." Mohammedan women should never think of overstepping the limits placed on their liberty. . . . The Turkish ladies . . . seem to be just a little inclined towards adopting the ways of European liberty, and this gives rise to a fear in my heart that these ways may prove full of some dangers to them.'

Comment, other than that her Highness considers the veil to be imposed by the tenets of Islam, and went about Europe enshrouded in a *burq'a*, as she has done in India throughout her life, is superfluous.

In the face of this conservatism, the Orient is moving forward —not only the Orient of the men, but also of the women.

Saint Nihal Singh.

THE NEW RENAISSANCE IN FRANCE

1. **L'Orientation Religieuse de la France actuelle.** Par PAUL SABATIER. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin. 1912.
2. **La Crise Française.** Par ANDRÉ CHÉRADAME. Paris: Librairie Plon. 1912.
3. **Pour la Patrie.** Par LE COMTE ALBERT DE MUN (de l'Académie Française). Paris: Émile-Paul. 1912.
4. **La Renaissance de l'Orgueil Français.** Par ÉTIENNE REY. Paris: Bernard Grasset. 1912.

> 'She shall rise worthier of her prototype
> Thro' her abasement deep; the pain that runs
> From nerve to nerve some victory achieves.
> They lie like circle-strewn, soaked Autumn-leaves
> Which stain the forest scarlet, her fair sons!
> And of their death her life is: of their blood
> From many streams now urging to a flood,
> No more divided, France shall rise afresh.'
>
> **France, December 1870.** By GEORGE MEREDITH.

NO country offers such fascinating fields for moral survey as France. Since Caesar's day she has had a reputation for lightness which events, during the last hundred years or so, do not seem to have belied. Her course has been singularly varied—now up, now down, now on the crest of the wave, now in the trough. While German development has been regularly ascensional, the French graph is a series of tormented lines. If descent has been rapid, equally rapid has been the rise. For some time a crisis has affected her, so obvious as to attract the attention of the superficial. But if that period seems now to have passed, there are problems enough left to exercise her philosophy and even to inspire our anxiety. Disorder reigns. One instance of it is the activity of the Apache, while the prevalence of juvenile crime has startled every observer. Maître Henri Robert, the well-known criminal lawyer, has devoted a lecture to the subject, deploring the precocity of many of the persons charged with serious offences. Alcoholism has increased to an incredible extent amongst the working population, both in the towns and in many country districts. There are more dram-shops in Paris, the City of Light, than in

San Francisco, and eleven times more than in London. The increase in the number of young men rejected from military service for physical disability, and the increase in insanity and criminality, are largely traceable to this cause.

'Is it not humiliating to state,' asks M. André Chéradame in 'La Crise Française,' 'that the French people, who are amongst 'the most civilised in the world, allow themselves to be degene-'rated and decimated by alcohol just like the Redskins of the 'American Far West and the inferior native races of the 'globe?'

So much for demoralisation by drink. In public life, scandals have thrown a lurid light on the morality of officials. Writers of current literature leave us to infer that disinterestedness is dead—buried with the honesty of politicians and the virtue of their wives. Statistics darken rather than lighten the shadows. The number of babies and the number of churchgoers are diminishing in about the same proportions. Half a century ago a million children were born into France each year; now the number has fallen to 742,000, representing an excess of nearly thirty-five thousand deaths. The village churches are as unpeopled as the village hearths. In many cases the curé, unable to live upon the offerings of the faithful, turns to supplementary occupations.

Again, unbelief loosens the bond between the citizen and the Church. The priest is half suspected of being an impostor. The number of Easter communicants—sign of the vitality of the Church—has seriously declined in industrial districts. The number of religious marriages has followed the same line of descent. If the rites of the Church in baptism, communion, marriage and burial are still observed even in professedly free-thinking quarters, it is due to the social conservatism that is instinctive with the peasantry. Ferocious anti-clericalism has departed before the consciousness that it was pandering to the worst instincts of the nation; but indifference remains.

Foreigners, perhaps, express the most lively concern for the religious future of France, realising that with her fate is largely bound up that of Christendom. Will the same evils befall us? is the inevitable reflection. 'Hodie mihi, cras tibi.' France is the intellectual centre of the world. Anti-militarism, sabotage, syndicalism have attacked the universe, after having made their appearance on French soil. In the same way, the

scepticism which first sprang up in France has influenced every religious community. Nor is the unrest in England likely to follow a line essentially different from that adopted by the French workers two or three years ago. The general curve of democracy is first traced in France.

In religious matters France has reason to be disquieted. The Church was disestablished and disendowed with the smallest display of opposition. Save in isolated instances it seemed to arouse little feeling. Since that time the difficulties, moral and material, of Catholics have increased. The subject of ways and means is a constant preoccupation, and the absence of diocesan and parochial balance-sheets a negative sign of precarious resources. Secret by tradition, the Church is unwilling to expose her financial weakness to unsympathetic eyes.

And yet there is considerable quickening of the Catholic body. A proselytising zeal consumes the priesthood. The younger clergy, mounted on bicycles, cover large districts and economise staffs. They carry spiritual comfort to the farm-house and stimulate the château to good works. Social effort is vigorous in large centres. Church clubs and societies minister to young people's need for recreation and amusement. Catholic philanthropists interest themselves in the condition of the working baker, forced to labour throughout the night, in the miner, the shop assistant and factory-hand, and in the reclamation of fallen women. Fashionable fanes in Paris and the large towns keep their congregations and increase the proportion of men. But this activity serves only to accentuate the void. A well-known bishop (Mgr. Dadolle) declared recently to the Holy See that the number of practising Catholics in France did not exceed four or five millions, leaving thirty millions outside the fold. In the eloquence of these figures lies the true state of Catholic France. To argue that the Church must eventually disappear is to argue against probability and to ignore the strength of organised religion. But that its active exercise will cease in country parts within a limited space, unless a reaction takes place, is only too apparent.

At first sight the reluctance of the peasant to give tithe is evidence of materialism. And this trait seems accompanied by some loss of old-time virtues, such as courtesy, candour and civic courage. These things are alleged by persons having a

long acquaintance with France, who profess to find in the rural population a less fine sense of honour than existed before the war. Added to this is juvenile depravity. And the unctuous Englishman, after three weeks' stay in France, rubs his hands and says 'What did I tell you? There is neither religion 'nor morals here. Is not the dwindling population proof of 'God's doom upon the nation?'

Some excuse exists for this view. The visitor has looked around and found apparent evidence of decay. He has gone to the music-halls and theatres and seen plays and spectacles of a perverted sort; he has glanced at volumes on the railway bookstalls and been disgusted at their cynicism and wanton tone. Perhaps he has attended the cathedral of a provincial city and heard the preacher denounce the un-Christian teaching of the elementary schools. Or he has read a newspaper in which some deputy of the Right has attacked the Government for a scandal affecting the probity of its officials. 'What! call this a Christian country, a community with 'religious instincts! Impossible!' But perhaps later he has returned to France and found facts that did not square with his first impressions. He has found a strong movement against pornography and against the pandering to vice of cosmopolitan purveyors. He has seen the Government initiate measures against the White Slave trade. In the Legislature, Bills have passed ensuring Sunday rest for workers, the protection of women's wages, and the safeguarding of the 'fille mère.' Are these symptoms of irreligion and decadence, he wonders? And he may realise that juvenile criminality is due not so much to widespread depravity as to a wrong application of the laws, an overstrained sense of humanity, which leads juries to liberate when they should convict. And this mistaken clemency is exercised in as large a proportion as one-third of the cases presented.

France has exhibited strength in unexpected ways. Her young men have adopted sport. They have shown remarkable aptitude in golf, tennis and football, and notably in boxing. Who supposed that a French Rugby team would beat Scotland one day, or that a French boxer would become a champion of the world? More recently a French girl has carried off the Ladies' Championship in tennis, and the national successes in golf are frequent. Even when beaten in their games, the French

exhibit an endurance and pluck which, in our pride, we had hitherto supposed to be exclusively Anglo-Saxon virtues.

The renaissance of sport in France—the phrase has become classic—has followed other lines as well. It has resulted in, or at least accompanied, a national movement astonishing to Europe. When Germany sent a ship to Agadir as summary intimation that her Moroccan interests must be respected, a tremor of indignation ran through the country. Nor was M. Caillaux' Danegeld to the national taste. To trade away territory acquired by blood seemed a sorry procedure to a nation that had ceased to be afraid.

The temper of the 'Conseils généraux,' the barometer of French opinion, was unprovocative but firm. They realised the danger of resistance, but they were prepared to resist. They passed resolutions regretting the character of the bargain made with the eastern neighbour. Nor was there in this attitude any false hope of cross-Channel assistance. The Entente was scarcely a factor in the case. 'We must be prepared to 'stand alone' was the national thought. And, undismayed by the knowledge of the legions massed behind the frontier, within a few hours of the capital, France went resolutely to work to put her military and, as one might say, her moral house in order.

Like a bad dream passed the anti-militarism, which had cast its evil shadow over the defences of the country. The navy under Admiral Boué de Lapeyrère, and now under M. Delcassé, recovered the discipline lost during the disastrous rule of M. Pelletan. And the army found in M. Millerand (a Socialist who has 'evolved') a master of organisation of unexpectedly military temper. In a few months the spirit of the army was changed. Freed from politics and from spying and informing upon the opinions of its officers, it could devote itself exclusively to its military mission. The military parades each week bring thousands into the streets to shout once again 'Vive l'armée!' a cry which has scarcely been heard since pre-Dreyfus days. The Ministers' active patronage of aviation has coincided with a great movement to dower the nation with an aerial arm. Subscriptions have flowed in from all quarters, and one of the most striking features is the gift of aeroplanes from the secondary schools. The fact is full of promise for the future of France.

North, south, east, west, emanations of the national spirit have arisen. France has rediscovered her greatness, and, as M. Étienne Rey says in 'La Renaissance de l'Orgueil Français,' she has found again her pride. The Gallic sap once more rises in the tree. The country has renewed her youth. Even Parliament has felt the influence. A Ministry of All the Talents has assembled under M. Poincaré, the ablest and most respected Premier that France has had since M. Waldeck-Rousseau. It shows its temper for improvement by introducing a Bill for Electoral Reform which is an attempt to inject new blood into exhausted parliamentary veins.

In the repression of crime, too, great energy is now being shown. The police is reorganised; criminals are hunted down with more speed and greater certainty. Everywhere is a reaction against those disintegrating forces which threatened the life and security of the nation.

These are conditions favourable to growth. A nation awakened seeks to realise its soul, and France enquires of its philosophers 'Which is the way?' This spirit is reflected in the newspapers. The 'Matin' and the 'Echo de Paris' discuss whether there is a relation between godless youth and 'Godless' teaching in the school. Is the scholar's manual too indeterminate to fix a standard, to inculcate an ideal? Is the State teacher neglecting character in building up the intellect? It seems to be admitted that there is a loss of ideal even by those most favourable to the present régime.

From the schools the enquiry extends to the country at large. Writers of talent and distinction ask us to consider the possibility of religious reconstruction. Is Paradise lost because of a rejection of dogma? Is no salvation possible without a belief in the supernatural? It is the old, old controversy which is tormenting the religious-minded in France, using the expression in its widest sense. It may be stated as Positive *versus* Literal religion.

'The Church must have faith in the modern spirit if it 'wishes to accomplish its mission in the twentieth century.' The phrase is M. Monod's, a Protestant pastor of Paris; but it has been made the text of a remarkable book by M. Paul Sabatier: 'L'Orientation Religieuse de la France actuelle.' Though of Protestant origin, M. Sabatier is no longer bound by the tenets of his Communion. He has escaped into the larger

air of speculative religion. Such a transition is not uncommon in France. There would seem to be a broad bridge between advanced Protestantism and Free Thought.

M. Sabatier acknowledges that moral anarchy exists, but he will not accuse the schools. In this he resembles Pastor Charles Wagner, the author of ' The Simple Life,' who states that the morality taught by the State teacher is that of all sacred literature. If there is unusual depravity amongst the young, it is due, M. Wagner thinks, not to the lack of definitions in unsectarian teaching, but to the prevalence of drink and pornography, the weakness of the law, and a general slackening of discipline. He considers it monstrous to accuse the schoolmaster of the crimes of some of his scholars. In his own book, M. Sabatier quotes with approval the view that the moral crisis is increased by parents who teach their children doctrines they do not believe. The young receptive minds are quick to see the incongruity. Again, in the schools, there is hesitancy on the part of many teachers who, having broken with the old faith, are in doubt how to communicate the new.

Amidst the crash of idols arises the figure of the Christ. It looms through the mist of doubt and scepticism ; it colours the utterances of such philosophers as Bergson, Boutroux and Guyau. Nor, says M. Sabatier, is the sceptical spirit inimical to the religious. He asserts this with an array of facts and a reading of philosophy which are extremely suggestive. France has thrown down her gods, because they were unsatisfactory. They were mute upon the great questions, or ambiguous, like the oracles of old. The soul craves for something better.

Mistrust of the Church has resulted from her attitude after the war. Her teaching brought no comfort to souls troubled by the national disaster. The people asked for bread and were given a stone. After the ' De Profundis ' and ' Miserere ' had died away beneath the vaulted roof only a confused murmur remained. To the prayers for the glorious dead succeeded no message for the living.

The seeds of dissatisfaction then sown resulted, nearly forty years later, in indifference to the fate of the Church. M. Briand's Bill for separating the Church from the State raised little protest outside Catholic circles. If scenes occurred in Brittany and in Paris, at the taking of the inventories, it was because the proceeding smacked of personal offence. But the

comparative indifference shown, first to the expulsion of the Orders, and, secondly, to the disestablishment and disendowment, was significant of lost Catholic power.

But M. Sabatier does not claim any advantage for the Protestant. Nor does he admit the Protestant contention that if France had had a Luther, there would have been no Sedan. France has fallen out with all the Churches, and nothing apparently remains to her but the reconstituted religion which finds a lofty and, indeed, ' pious ' endorsement in M. Sabatier's pages. But the transition period is painful. The author does not lay sufficient stress upon it, nor upon the fact that the battleground of the old and the new systems is in the elementary school. Hostility has re-awakened between the curé and the schoolmaster in many villages, and the neutrality prescribed by the Act of 1882 has disappeared, or with difficulty survives. Colourless and attenuated, the ' morality ' can be scarcely nourishing to young minds ; and the ideal set before the embryo citizen must be singularly warped by violent Catholic mis-statement on the one side and anti-clerical rancour on the other.

Nor are the sublimities of any philosophy available for the mass, which cannot appreciate subtleties. Bergson has not become the daily guide of the working man. The formula must be founded upon religious precept to be of wide application. This fascinating and eternal subject receives full and liberal treatment from M. Sabatier, who holds that French rejection of the religious nostrums that flourish in America is a sign of eclecticism. Marianne sends away her suitors not from lack of heart but from superior instinct. ' France is a religious ' country.' If the statement startles, it is because we have been accustomed only to regard a superficial France, given up to pleasure and money-making. We have to reconcile ' a rapid ' progress of indifference with an unexpected awakening of ' religious aspiration.' But until the new faith is defined there will be confusion and disaster.

The new religion is without ecclesiasticism ; ' there were ' Christians before Christ.' Having dethroned the Roman Church and given no mandate to the Protestants, France is troubled about her spiritual position. Religious she is, in the sense of search for righteousness and of sacrifice for truth. Were not the Dreyfusards ' religious ' ? Many lost their

prospects in life through their championship of the Jew. His lawyer, Maître Labori, temporarily ruined his practice by his defence at Rennes. And Zola with his 'J'accuse . . .'—was not that an act of piety comparable with the sufferings of the Early Christians for the Faith? Happily for the race, Frenchmen are ever ready to lay family affection and earthly treasure on the altar of a great idea. Hence, a state of worship exists, despite the satirist who said 'There is not 'enough religion in France to make two.'

Men are working out their salvation in the spirit recommended by St. James; but they are accused of irreligion as were those who broke with paganism. That is the history of the world. To throw down the statues of the gods may not prove incredulity so much as a higher notion of divinity. The ecclesiastical position must not be confounded with the religious position; the two are often antithetical.

The ecclesiastical position is certainly alarming. And yet the Church has never been more active. It cannot take comfort from the thought that divergent rivers are emptying themselves into the same sea. Contrary currents contribute to a similar set of ethics. Even Jean-Jacques Rousseau, with his revolutionary theories, prepared the way for the reconstruction of the Catholic faith. The 'spiral spiritualism' of Bergson attains the same end. Guyau, who wrote the wrongly named 'Irreligion of the Future' (now become a text-book after twenty years), is inspired with the purest religious sentiment. 'It is good,' he says, 'to think that man should have 'ideals above his strength; generally, they are below it.' But he is concerned for the education of the priest, whose horizon must be enlarged to fit him for the new conditions of life.

Renan's 'irreligion' led him to say that he would not detach a single immature soul from the Tree of Faith. Maeterlinck is pictured bending with mystic fervour over what Carlyle called 'the great internal Sea of Beauty.' All are contributing to the new France, the rejuvenated France. But philosophers such as Bergson, Boutroux and William James have not led the movement. Rather have they followed the crowd pressing on towards the New City. The 'orientation actuelle,' according to this admirable observer, results from 'the labour 'and thought and spiritual activity of our country seeking its

'way.' It has no relation with German mentality, even with German Protestantism. It is essentially French and born of the soil.

And then we come to the main argument of the book, the argument that reveals M. Sabatier's optimistic estimate of new tendencies in France. Free-thought is not necessarily anti-religious, and the meeting place of belief with unbelief has been found in a movement uniting the liberal Catholic with the honest sceptic.

Such arguments would take us far, nor are we sure that the brilliant author quite makes out his case. That forces powerful for good are operating in France we are convinced; that a nation can survive morally upon cold reason or even 'spiral 'spiritualism' is another question. Meanwhile, we must believe that much of the present crisis, though not all, has sprung from mistakes in Church policy. Rome has misapprehended Republicanism; it has flirted with reaction; it has sanctioned political deception in such terms as 'Liberal' and 'Progressive' as applied to Moderate and Conservative elements—though 'Radical-Socialist' is little better; it has shut the door on science and barred the Sorbonne to the 'soutane'; it has taught dogma as a definite object and not merely as a means, thereby disgusting the younger democracy. But this is not all. The Church has won morally its fight with the State. It refused to comply with the Act of Separation by setting up parochial machinery that could be recognised by the Government. Nevertheless, worship is conducted without let or hindrance in the churches. Yet circumstances are too strong. The obedience that makes the unity of the Church; the obedience that inclined the bishops to Rome after their advice had been rejected, will not prevail against the indifference to the externals of religion exhibited by a large portion of the community. The working classes have lost the habit of confession. The peasant may call the priest at the moment of bereavement because the mumbled Latin gives comfort to his troubled soul, but he will not be chastened into acceptance of the Church's teaching.

The bright side, the side of hope, is presented by M. Sabatier. He argues that the new forces are powerful to form a new nation, to revivify the old. Religion exists, but it is unconnected with formalism. It is founded on ideals, but it is independent

of dogma. It is full of virtue and 'piety' in the classic sense; but it rejects what it cannot understand. The road does not lead to Rome; but it may lead to the Mount of Olives. The splendour of the future is reflected in the vigour of the physical renaissance. That is what we are asked to believe. Is it true? Events alone can justify or refute M. Sabatier. Meanwhile, two facts are undoubted: the awakening of a new spirit in France and the diligent enquiry into the causes of the moral crisis past and present.

In 'La Crise Française,' M. André Chéradame treats the question from a different point of view. He admits fully the justice of his title—the crisis is only too apparent. His early chapters are particularly depressing. One has only to cite their headings to realise their tenour: 'Our general inferior-'ity'; 'the depopulation'; 'alcoholism'; 'the failure of 'Parliamentarism'; 'where Collectivism is leading the country.' One of the sub-sections deals with 'the amazing scandal of the 'powders,' which resulted, of course, in the blowing up of the 'Liberté.' 'How anarchy and revolution are organised in 'France' continues the story, and we have sidelights on the Confédération Générale du Travail, which is the head-centre of syndicalism in France. Another section deals with Gustave Hervé, the notorious anti-militarist, and his revolutionary journal 'La Guerre Sociale.' Then in Chapter V. we hear of the powerlessness of the police and the strength of the 'Syndicats.' Here is no pleasant picture, nor is it relieved when the author deals with its broad effects.

M. Chéradame gives proper importance to the 'Affair.' Many have realised that it was the Armageddon between clericalism—as Gambetta understood the word—and the Republic; but few Englishmen realise that from that moment dated the decadence of France. She lost conceit of herself, and such a weakening of national pride is specially dangerous to France, where 'amour propre' is a strong and living impulse. The Dreyfus case was the screen behind which the enemies of the country worked to tear down the army and the Church and all notions of patriotism. These reflections are quite apart from the guilt or innocence of the Jewish officer, but they explain much in the present national movement in France. They explain that the Renaissance is a revolt—a revolt against the exaggerated condemnation of French honour, courage, and

justice which succeeded in lowering to a lamentable degree the vitality of the nation.

Like all susceptible people, the French require a sympathetic atmosphere in which to expand. Perhaps one of the strangest phenomena of that time was the disappearance of patriotic songs from the cafés-concerts, where the repertoire is a sure indication of public feeling. And the students of the Latin Quarter abstained, as in a sort of horror, from any manifestation that might seem to enshrine the national spirit. Even the Nationalists were regarded as political pariahs.

That large section of the public which supported the Government against what was considered political tyranny and abuse of military justice has now begun to realise that it was a dupe in the Affair, that it was playing into the hands of the haters of France. It is because of this that to-day a contrary movement is seen. The new Renaissance is a revolt against the lowered prestige of France. Even at the height of the turmoil there were observers in England who regretted intensely the lengths to which the anti-militarist spirit was being carried in France. They realised what an unfortunate effect the same spirit might have in England. Perhaps some of the symptoms of unrest, now visible on our side of the Channel, may have originated in this curious outburst in France, in which old principles and traditions were flung into the melting-pot.

The other day, when the Queen of Holland came to Paris, there was a great parade of troops for her reception. The crowd's welcome to M. Millerand, Minister of War, was most enthusiastic as he drove up in the suite of her Majesty. Parisians realised that one of the greatest achievements of the ex-Socialist Minister is to have turned the current of anti-militarism to a fervent faith in France.

We seem far from the days when spying and informing raged, when the abominable system of the 'fiches' was invented, or at least fostered, by the régime of General André, then Minister of War. The spark which fired the train of patriotism was 'le coup d'Agadir,' the German Emperor's action a year ago in sending the 'Panther' to Moroccan waters. The nation awakened suddenly to realities—after thirty years of illusion. In his stirring book 'Pour la Patrie,' which consists of articles and speeches on France and her foreign relations,

the Comte de Mun, of the Académie Française and deputy for Finistère, writes : ' For a year I have lived in constant com-' munion with all sorts and conditions of men ; I have corre-' sponded with them ; I have tried to understand their soul. And ' this is what I have read there : the entire nation is absorbed ' in the spirit of patriotism. It is the conclusion of this book ' and it is the supreme consolation and the supreme hope of ' France.' Again, quite recently, we have seen public resentment in Paris against the suggestion that Germany required a formal ceremony for the transference of the territories handed over to her under the Moroccan treaty.

The discussion that has taken place on the subject of an alliance or entente with England has revealed, also, the new *état d'âme*. Probably a large majority of French people would welcome an alliance identifying the political fortunes of the two countries ; but a constant threat of war has the advantage of stimulating the national energy. ' Only the ' strong are respected,' said ex-President Loubet on a memorable occasion. If France allowed herself to drift she would be lost. And some weakening of the national spirit would surely follow if Frenchmen concluded that, whatever they did, and to whatever lengths they allowed their political passions to go in disintegrating the country, England was behind them with her invincible fleet, her efficient if small army, and her inexhaustible purse. Better, says M. Chéradame in a recent article in the ' Petit Journal,' to let the Entente remain the Entente, with infinite possibilities for a common action.

It seems certain that the alliance with Russia has had a certain deadening and soporific influence, but here again great exaggeration has been shown. The French hailed their Slav allies as their saviours. ' Are we not now safe from all attack ? ' is the foolish spirit which inspired the transports. But that France should be taught to rely upon herself and to look only to herself for salvation is surely the best lesson that can be given her to-day. Like all imaginative people, the French need to come into contact with hard facts to correct an exaggerated ideality and a disposition to take desires for realities. Philosophers may seem to demonstrate the end of war by reason of its absurdities, its ruinous cost, and the impossibility of driving home a conquest or of crushing an adversary without being crushed oneself. But to-morrow the guns will still

boom and the shells will fly when national tempers are aroused, as if no one had ever written anything but the most inconsequent praise of war.

M. Chéradame is infinitely comforting when he deals with solutions. There is a common ground between himself and M. Sabatier. He has faith in France, in Young France. It is as if he would say 'Do not take us too seriously, dear friends, 'when we grow depressed, when the mercury falls in the baro-'meter. Believe in our national genius and the ultimate triumph 'of our ideals.' If symptoms of self-indulgence flourish and are accompanied by political evils, France may take comfort in the thought that conditions of a somewhat similar sort exist in other countries, notably in America, which is providing in its Presidential Election an unedifying example of Democracy. But if labour unrest, growing materialism, and a dwindling population exist in America, in England, and in Germany, France has little cause for complacency. Her progress along a given path is always more rapid than that of her neighbours. The Gallic car is higher-powered than the rest.

The brake, then, must be applied, or at least the impetus gathered in the descent must be used for mounting the hill. And this is what we are now witnessing. There is more than a gleam of hope in the fact that at the time when these lines are being written the French Parliament is engaged in reforming the electoral system in the hope that a wider electoral area may produce a superior type of politician; and, at the same time, that the representation of minorities may result in the formation of an Opposition capable of acting as a check and as a critic upon the party in power.

Whether list-voting combined with proportional representation will give the results expected of it, none can say; but it is significant that some of the strongest supporters of the present system have been most emphatic in their condemnation of the ills that exist under it. It is alleged that self-interest, nepotism, and 'esprit du clocher' are the leading characteristics of the deputies elected under the existing system of 'scrutin 'd'arrondissement.'

Though the old-time struggle between the village schoolmaster and the curé has revived in some districts, as M. Sabatier points out, there is a suspicion abroad that anti-clericalism is a mischievous programme, which has wrought harm to the

country under the vain pretext of breaking priestcraft. As impartial historians, we are not inclined to minimise the part played by intriguing clericals, or to overlook the mistakes in policy of the Church ; but the great majority of French people have now realised that in supporting the excesses of the campaign that drove out the teaching orders and sisterhoods they were not only pandering to unworthy instincts, but diminishing the religious and moral patrimony of France.

M. Chéradame's arguments are well closed by this penetrating phrase : ' France is again at the turning of her history. ' Slowly and painfully she is ascending the slope. If she com- ' prehends the imperishable truth of the old adage " Union is ' strength " ; if she knows how to become consistent and ' methodical and how to remedy her political ills, she is at ' the dawn of a new Renaissance.'

A FAMOUS HERESY TRIAL

1. **The Life of William Robertson Smith.** By JOHN SUTHERLAND BLACK and GEORGE CHRYSTAL. London: A. and C. Black. 1912.
2. **Lectures and Essays of William Robertson Smith.** Edited by JOHN SUTHERLAND BLACK and GEORGE CHRYSTAL. A. and C. Black. 1912.
3. **Life of Principal Rainy.** By P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON. Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.

THE 'gangrel Scot' in Stevenson's well-known poem describes 'outlandish' preachers with severity:

> 'This yin a stot, an' thon a stirk—
> A bletherin clan, no warth a preen,
> As bad as Smith of Aiberdeen!'

A generation lies between us and the controversy of which Smith was the centre; and to many the name of the great Orientalist may recall little more than the above lines. But at the time that name stood for a principle which, though few dispute it in words to-day, was then novel and startling: the principle that the Bible must be read like any other book—critically, that is to say, and intelligently. 'Let him that 'readeth understand.' Important religious issues were bound up with this position, and it was a misfortune that the controversy was fought out rather on the intellectual than on the religious side. The result was that the ideal values for which the conflicting tendencies stood were confused. Criticism was associated with rationalism, traditionalism with spirituality. Such associations were accidental and temporary. Mysticism is the barometer of piety; and from the first mysticism has sat loose to tradition: it has refused to teach 'for doctrines the 'commandments of men.' Differing, and differing widely, in temper and method, the mystic and the scholar are interiorly akin. Both are intolerant of formula; both, regarding names and symbols as, if not indifferent, at least secondary, make by a homing instinct for the truth of things. Nor need religion fear the alliance of either.

'Jérusalem est sortie plus brillante et plus belle du travail en apparence destructeur de la science moderne. Les pieux récits dont on a bercé notre enfance sont devenus, grâce à une saine

interprétation, de hautes vérités ; et c'est à nous qui voyons Israël dans sa réelle beauté, c'est à nous autres critiques qu'il appartient vraiment de dire, "*Stantes erant pedes nostri in atriis tuis, Jerusalem.*" ' (Renan, 'Études d'histoire religieuse.')

The Free, now the United Free, Church of Scotland was, within living memory, of all the great Reformed Churches the least open to, or capable of dealing with, ideas. It is now, perhaps, the most accessible to and assimilative of them. The same reverence for truth which brought about the Disruption led a later generation to even greater sacrifices, greater because interests of a more directly spiritual order were involved. In each case the result justified the venture. In the one the freedom of the Church, in the other liberty of faith and of individual conscience was attained. The latter controversy centred in the person and history of William Robertson Smith. In Scotland at least the interest in the cause for which he stood is still vivid, and history can seldom be written to advantage till the chief actors have disappeared from the scene. Dr. Black and Mr. Chrystal have done their work with loyalty and candour ; but, as loyalty is not indiscrimination, so candour is not indifference. Their judgment on the events which they record is clear. It was that of the more far-seeing men in the Church at the time ; it will be, it has already become, that of posterity. There are lights and shadows in the portraits ; were it not so, art and nature would be at strife. But the lines in which a too little read poet, William Cory, in his 'Ionica,' contrasts Ulysses and Ajax, sum up the protagonists of the drama with substantial accuracy.

'The world may like, for all I care,
The gentler voice, the cooler head,
That bows a rival to despair,
And cheaply compliments the dead.

That smiles at all that's coarse and rash,
Yet wins the trophies of the fight ;
Unscathed in honour's wreck and crash,
Heartless, yet always in the right.

Thanked and self-pleased, ay let him wear
What to that nobler breast was due ;
But I, dear passionate Teucer, dare
Go through the homeless world with you!'

A son of the manse, William Robertson Smith possessed its characteristic qualities—energy, self-reliance, and a power which found its own outlet, often in unexpected channels. His bent was from the first positive. 'Everything came to him 'through the intellect'; he was intolerant of people who were interested in things 'in a mild way.' His appetite for knowledge was universal; he cross-examined workmen at Keig as persistently as in later years he cross-examined tribesmen in Arabia. His judgments were unembarrassed by convention; he dismissed a popular religious romance of his early years with 'the devastating epigram that it was "more childish 'than childhood itself."' A terrible child! but surely a rather pitiful one. His boyhood, though its outward surroundings were happier, recalls that of John Stuart Mill; and the strain of his university life, begun at fifteen, was murderous. A brother and a sister died under it; he himself laid the seeds of the complaint which carried him off in his prime. Eager, over-eager, as he was for academic distinction, he was exceptionally unworldly. Most men of his mathematical and scientific attainments would have aimed at a wider career than that of the ministry. But the direction of his mind never varied; and at the unprecedented age of twenty-four he found himself Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College of Aberdeen.

His temperament and personality were strongly marked. He was curiously destitute of what is called, in no bad sense, unction. A hearer, while acknowledging the devotional impression left by his ministrations, notices 'the natural irreverence 'of his voice.' 'His gifts,' says a contemporary account of the Assembly of 1881, 'are cleverness and memory. He 'is as empty of reverence and as smart as a weasel, and he has 'as little common sense as a sucking calf.' He could not understand why his speculations caused perplexity and irritation, and he shut his eyes to the fact that they did. Principal Rainy does not show to advantage in the complicated and protracted proceedings before the Assemblies of 1878–1881. But, if Rainy had an instinct for lobbying in which Smith was wanting, he had also an instinct for souls which Smith, with all his great powers, did not possess. Yet it is impossible to doubt Smith's genuine and evangelical piety. A letter written (1887) to his dying brother shows the real man—the

more significantly in view of his habitual and perhaps excessive reticence on the deeper things of life.

'I write on this quiet Sabbath forenoon, on which I hope that you also, in spite of your pains, are able to think of the rest which remaineth for the people of God. None of us can enter into that rest without passing through pain and trial, even as He passed Who is our great Forerunner. You have had a sore share of trials; and yet perhaps one easier to bear than a long life of prosperity and worldly cares which make it very hard to keep near to God. . . . Do not look inwards, and vex yourself with self-questionings about faith and assurance and such like things. God gives a joyous assurance to some of His servants; but He gives peace to all who simply throw themselves on Him, humbly accepting His will, looking to Him as children to a father, and beseeching Him to be with them and carry all their burdens.' (Life, p. 493.)

His conception of religion was strenuous; and the 'mortifi-'cation of the understanding' prescribed by medieval—and not a few modern—divines formed no part of it. An extract from one of his student diaries defines the standpoint which he occupied throughout.

'Intellectual culture, say some, is apt to make a man less spiritual. This supposes the spiritual part of the mind to be a peculiar faculty. In fact the emotional is meant. But a man may as readily err by trusting his own emotions as by trusting his own intellect. Spirituality is not the development of one part of the mind, but the development of the whole mind *in a special direction*.' (Life, p. 64.)

These were not the lines on which conformity to 'the 'tradition of the elders' was likely to be reached; nor was his theological training calculated to develop this attitude. With the notable exception of A. B. Davidson, the Edinburgh Divinity school of his time was not inspiring. As a lecturer, Rainy was heavy; of 'Rabbi' Duncan it was said that he taught his pupils everything but Hebrew, of which he was professor; Blaikie is described, ambiguously, as possessing 'an unrivalled gift for appealing to the average mind.' The Church was in the hands of the Epigoni. It lay in the trough of a great wave; the time was that of 'the ebb which succeeded 'the mighty surge of the Disruption.' The Moody movement, the importance of which it would be difficult to overestimate, had brought about a deep and widespread religious revival. But this revival had been on the spiritual side only: no tide of

knowledge, no breath of criticism, had stirred the dogmatic slumber of the Church. In England 'Essays and Reviews' had appeared ten years earlier. But English Liberal theology was, and has remained, academic; and though the average Scotsman was interested in the questions which that famous book had raised, the average Englishman was not. Even in Scotland, however, the Church had neither the knowledge nor the courage required to deal with them; the light was too strong for the unprepared eye. The ignorance of the time was amazing. A northern professor laid down that disbelief in the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy meant disbelief in the Deity. The writer remembers a worthy man who spoke of a colleague as an atheist; and, on being asked on what grounds he made this confident assertion, replied, with a strange confusion of thought, that 'to his knowledge Mr. A. did not believe in—the Devil'! *Ergo*—but the conclusion is better left undrawn.

Of religiosity of this kind Smith was frankly contemptuous. He saw that it was ridiculous; he believed that it was insincere. For him, as for Socrates, virtue was knowledge: to the day of his death he never adequately realised either the ignorance or the stupidity of average mankind. His inaugural lecture however was tactful. The Catholic Church, he told his hearers, had almost from the first deserted the Apostolic tradition in setting up a conception of Christianity as a mere system of *σωτήρια δόγματα*—a series of formulae containing abstract and immutable principles, intellectual assent to which was sufficient to mould the lives of men who had no experience of a personal relation with Christ. In opposition to this, he maintained, Scripture was not 'a divine phenomenon magically 'endowed in every letter with saving treasures of faith and 'knowledge.' The personal relation of the individual Christian to the Redeemer was indispensable. Viewed from this standpoint, the Bible was 'the vast and *animated* record, perpetuated 'under the supreme sanction of the divine will, of the mighty 'redeeming purpose ever present to the holy and inscrutable 'mind of God.'

'Regarded in any other way the historical connection of the Old and New Testaments is lost or misunderstood. Difficulties of interpretation, difficulties of faith and morals are multiplied; and the only refuge for the believer is, on the one hand, an inadmissible allegorical exegesis borrowed from the Hellenistic Jews,

and, on the other, a recourse to the mystical and magical sacramentalism which had once for all been abandoned at the Reformation. . . . We must let the Bible speak for itself. Our notions of the origin, the purpose, the character of the Scriptures must be drawn not from vain traditions, but from historical study of the books themselves. This process can be dangerous to faith only when it is begun without faith—when we forget that the Bible is no profane history, but the story of God's saving self-manifestation.'

In other words he stood for the open as opposed to the closed Bible ; for the living spirit of the Reformation as opposed to the dead hand of the medieval Church.

His conception of his professorial duties was large. He was in correspondence with the leading scholars of the Continent—Ritschl, Lagarde, Wellhausen ; he had already begun to interest himself in Arabia—its language, literature, and institutions, aware that, if any real progress in Hebrew was to be made, it was essential to get behind current traditions, and study Semitic civilisation as a whole. He had a profound distrust of short cuts to knowledge—of which his essay on 'Hegel and the Metaphysics of the Fluxional Calculus' is an example ; and with regard to theology in particular he would have echoed Rothe's criticism of Schleiermacher's Dialectic—'Ich kenne nur zwei wissenschaftliche Fühlhörner : strenge, 'gründliche Philologie und Geschichte.' In 1875 his article 'Bible' appeared in the 'Encyclopaedia Britannica.' The positions taken were advanced ; and by an unfortunate error of judgment, whether on the part of the editor or the writer is not clear, a carefully written paragraph, asserting 'the unique 'religious value of the Bible as the record of a specific super-'natural Revelation,' was omitted. Had this formed part of the text, the case might have had a different ending. The most that could have been urged against the author would have been that, like the Thomist in the 'Provincial Letters,' he held two contradictory propositions at the same time. How many a reputation for orthodoxy has been maintained by this simple expedient ! When hanging is so easily avoided, why hang ? And he was on strong ground when he pointed out the medievalism of popular Biblical theology : what he overlooked was the tenacity of the medieval mind. This is still with us, and will be with us long. It is possible to live in the modern world without being in any sense akin to it. 'All are not

'Israelites who are of Israel': to the average man such conceptions as those of evidence, law, cause and effect, etc., are foreign and even unintelligible; he is disjointed, and lives as it were fragmentarily and piecemeal in a connected world. This accounts for the survival not only of the more unthinking orthodoxies, but for the religious aberrations, differing rather in form than in substance from those of the Lower Empire, which so often crop up in modern life—spiritualism, theosophy, faith-healing, and the like. 'Why should it not be so?' their advocates ask us; and the medieval mind can give no sufficient reason: it echoes, in a lower tone, the question, 'Why?'

It was from this quarter that attack threatened: it was delivered first in the press, then in the College Committee, and finally in the Assembly. Rainy, perhaps wisely, counselled conciliation; but Smith was not conciliatory: his caustic criticism of his counsellor was: 'He does not, so far as I can 'see, allow any weight to a conscientious persuasion that 'certain views are true.' His opponents were ignorant and slanderous—both in a high degree. 'Paracletum 'fugavit, prophetiam expulit,' said Tertullian of Praxeas; 'Inspiration in danger,' cried the traditionalists, 'prophecy 'denied.' One of their leaders persistently wrote of the eminent Dutch scholar Kuenen as 'Quenen'; another ascribed the style as well as the substance of the sacred books to the Deity; and 'whatever its origin,' is the judgment of the biographers, 'we deliberately say here that the identification of 'Smith's position with the position of those who held or hold 'that Deuteronomy was fabricated by Hilkiah was neither 'more nor less than a gross perversion of the truth.' The rotund oratory of the preacher was brought to bear on fine points of scholarship. Begg, the stormy petrel of orthodoxy, 'trembled for the Ark of God.' Smith's answer was memorable.

'He knew of but one character in Scripture who trembled for the Ark of God, and that was Eli—not the most admirable character in the Old Testament—*a worldly ecclesiastic.* Eli trembled for the Ark of God; and why? Because for him the Ark had ceased to be a shrine of the living revealing word of God, and had become a fetish, an idol, carried out to battle as if by its own power it could assist the Church in its warfare. Eli trembled for the Ark of God; and, as he trembled, he fell and perished. But there was no need

to tremble. The Ark was safe, not in virtue of the outward things at which Eli looked, but because it was the Ark of God's revelation. No man need tremble for that: God's revelation was safe.'

It was Newman's 'Apologia' on the floor of the Assembly. 'Impar congressus Achilli.' Begg's reputation was such as to render the onslaught deadly. 'For once,' says Rainy's biographer, 'his ruddy countenance blanched.' The libel, or technical indictment, was referred to a committee for adjustment; the case pursued its spiral course through the Church courts with varying fortunes; finally, though the libel, even in its amended form, was withdrawn, the Assembly, rejecting by a majority of seven the Rainy-Moncrieff motion which would have deprived Smith of his Chair, found that he was 'blame-'worthy for the unqualified and incomplete statements of his 'articles, which had occasioned much anxiety in the Church, 'and given offence to many brethren zealous for the word of 'God.' He was 'admonished with due solemnity' by the Moderator; and with this qualified decision the First Case came to an end.

The popular preacher who wrote Principal Rainy's Life is severe on English Erastianism; and observes, after a not too exact statement of what he calls 'the facts about the Colenso 'case,' that 'any English Churchman who can derive satis-'faction from these proceedings is best left to its enjoyment.' The case of the Bishop of Natal, it seems to us, was decided with incomparably greater wisdom and justice than that of the Aberdeen professor. The passions of the English clergy were indeed as ungoverned as those of their Scottish brethren: 'priests of all religions are the same.' But they were restrained by the civil courts, and by the final appeal to the King in Council: the Englishman, taught by experience, will have his Levites tame. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council does not profess to decide whether the opinions brought before it are true; but (a very different thing) whether they are covered by the formularies. The point is one which it is peculiarly competent, and which a so-called spiritual court is peculiarly incompetent, to decide. And perhaps of all tribunals the General Assembly is the least fitted for the discharge of judicial functions. The House of Commons, it has been said, is seen under its least favourable aspect when an ecclesiastical question is under discussion. It is probable that, in a heresy

case, the Assembly appears in an even worse light. Its members, with few exceptions, are lacking in the equipment of the scholar; while they are destitute both of the training of the lawyer and of the dispassionate acumen of the judge. The vulgar tricks of the pulpit—the brazen front, the strident voice—these are the arts that for many are the most effectual, and make members of the Assembly the predestined victims of the fanatic and the charlatan. But the Assembly, it must be admitted, produces on occasion men of a very different type; politicians who, themselves anything but fanatics, can make skilful use of fanaticism; managers of men, shrewd, concentrated, practical; opportunists who, whatever line they take up in life, succeed. Such was the famous Robert Rainy, who played so decisive a part in Smith's career. He was perhaps the best loved and the best hated man in Scotland; and it says much for him that in later years, and in particular in the controversies relating to the Union, he was followed implicitly by those who in 1878 to 1881 had been enthusiasts on Smith's side. It is possible that his standpoint altered; it is certain that the balance of opinion changed. Smith complained of his 'cold 'and selfish ambition,' and to the end spoke of him as a Jesuit. The fact was that the two men were incompatibles; neither ever caught the most distant glimpse of the other's point of view. Rainy was neither the Machiavelli of the one legend nor the Ambrose of the other. The Church owes him much; but by the necessity of his position he was a party leader; and the ice over which party leaders skate is thin. It is possible that the more direct course would have proved the better policy. The schism, averted for the time, came later: a firmer grasp of the nettle might have crushed the sting. Dr. Simpson, who has a no doubt hereditary antipathy to bishops, finds it 'difficult to imagine that powerful man swathed in the impres-'sive impotence of an Anglican prelate.' Well, imagination is free, and the Church which Rainy adorned is not episcopalian. But, for our part, we can see him presiding with dignity and force over a Lambeth Conference, lobbying the bishops, engineering non-committal resolutions through the various committees, and addressing the Pan-Anglican Synod with effect from St. Augustine's Chair, 'Archiepiscopus quasi 'natus'; he was an Archbishop to the manner born. Without

being a scholar, he was scholarly ; and no one knew the signs of the times better than he. He saw that the critical position was that of the near future ; and was determined to save the Church, in spite of herself, from taking up an impossible attitude on critical questions ; nay more, if he could do so without prejudice to what he judged more vital interests, he was willing to give the critics a helping hand. Being asked at an early stage in the Smith case how he proposed to act, he is said to have replied : ' In the Assembly as a statesman ; in ' literature as a scholar.' The saying is obviously *post eventum*, but he saw from the first that a practical question lay behind the speculative, and held it to be the more important of the two. By one of those strokes of fortune against which, it seems, human foresight is powerless, within ten days of the vote of the Assembly (May 28, 1880) the eleventh volume of the ' Encyclopaedia Britannica,' containing Smith's article, ' Hebrew Literature and Language,' appeared. The controversy at once flamed up ; and a paper on ' Animal Worship ' and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament,' published in the ' Journal of Philology,' fanned the fire. Rainy who was accustomed to hold the Assembly in the hollow of his hand, and who, in spite of his recent defeat, was still one of the most influential men in it, had persuaded himself that if a schism was to be avoided, Smith by hook or by crook must be removed. There was no second libel : but, having carried this point, he devoted himself to ' getting a sufficient number ' to agree ' on a way out of the difficulty. The way of least resistance led over Smith's body. He was set down as ' impossible ' ; and by a majority of 178 the Assembly declared its conviction that his occupancy of his professorship ' was no ' longer safe or advantageous for the Church ' (May 26, 1881). He might have taken action in the Civil Courts, but he refused to do so : his career as a theological teacher in his Church was closed.

It is doubtful whether any ' right,' in the strict sense of the word, was violated. ' Quamdiu se bene gesserit ' is a natural condition of office ; and the position is not in itself unreasonable that a man against whom it is impossible, or undesirable, to proceed on a formal charge of heresy may, under certain circumstances, be an unsuitable occupant of a theological chair. But the question was, was this a case for the exercise

of this exceptional and extraordinary power? The answer differed as men were guided by principle or by policy. 'I can-'not sit down,' said A. B. Bruce, 'without expressing my 'shame and sorrow at what is about to be done. I never 'expected to see the day when such a spectacle could be 'witnessed in our Church.' And Dr., now Principal, Whyte —a man who, while his evangelical orthodoxy has never been questioned, has stood through a long life with rare fidelity and courage for the larger spirit and the freer thought—warned the Assembly that they could not arrest the movement of mind in Christendom of which the inculpated writings were the outcome. 'The world of mind does not 'stand still; and the theological mind will stand still at its 'peril. I find no disparity, no difficulty, in carrying much of 'the best of our past with me in going out to meet and hail 'the new theological methods.' The standpoint of such men was that of Westcott—'Have faith in criticism; and have 'faith in God.'

Liberal Christianity may be described as the homage paid by orthodoxy to heterodoxy. And this homage increases; the heresy of yesterday is the theology of to-day. The positions contested in 1880 are now generally accepted. But there is still a head, and there is still a tail. Nor have their qualities, intellectual or moral, changed. The Old Testament has passed out of the stage of dogma; but the editors, in a significant passage, ask what reception would be given to-day in any Scottish Church to a scientific treatment of the New? It would probably depend a good deal on the character of the man, and the manner in which he treated his subject. A recent English instance is not without interest in this connexion. The Assembly shines by comparison. Smith had a trial, however unsatisfactory a trial. Mr. Thompson, because of the accident of his being unbeneficed, was condemned untried.

As the discerning mind of Tulloch saw, the issues raised were larger than the disputants recognised. 'Changes of all kinds 'must come with a changed view of Scripture . . . [the view 'that regards it] as an uncertain and progressive literature 'rather than as a literal code or transcript of the Divine 'mind'; and 'freedom of thought is the vital atmosphere 'of *all* theological labour and not merely of Bible criticism.' It is possible that Bain's view, that erudition rather than power

of dealing with ideas was Smith's strong point, had some foundation. But it is interesting to know that, when the arrangements for the 'Encyclopaedia Biblica' were under discussion, he wished the articles 'Gospels' and 'John' to be entrusted to H. J. Holtzmann; and that the venerable scholar, excusing himself on the ground of age and infirmity, recommended P. W. Schmiedel, by whom they were in fact written, for the work. Had he lived, it is possible that his view of the uniqueness of Old Testament revelation might have been modified; but it is improbable that his general religious outlook would have changed. It was temperamental with him to refuse to sacrifice either faith or reason: and 'this contradiction will 'disconcert those only who do not perceive that it is the 'ultimate contradiction inherent in human life. All intellectual 'experience, when analysed, presents the same antinomy.' From another point of view 'Spiritus ubi vult spirat.' The recognition of the human element in religion may advance hand in hand with the recognition of the Divine element on the larger field of the world.

It is pleasant to think that a Balliol living was spoken of for him; but pleasanter to remember that, 'injusta noverca' as he had found her, he remained a member and even a minister of his native Church to the end. He migrated first to Edinburgh, where he discharged the important duties of sub-editor of the 'Encyclopaedia Britannica'; and finally to Cambridge, where he was successively Reader in Arabic, Professor of Arabic, and University Librarian.

It was at this time that his most original work—on Arabian antiquities, and in particular on 'Animal Tribes and Animal 'Worship'—was done. As early as 1879 he had pointed out traces of the matriarchate in early Egyptian society, and of totemism among the Bedawin of Sinai. In 1880 the journey in the Hejâz, described in the most delightful of travel sketches, was undertaken. He travelled in Arab dress, under the name of Abdullah Effendi—a disguise which was a trial to his oversensitive veracity. Its disadvantage, he tells us, was that it gave his native companions the opportunity of telling many lies! J. F. McLennan's important articles on the 'Worship 'of Animals and Plants' (1869–70) had argued that from the earliest times, in very many cases, and in the most widely separated races, animals had been worshipped by tribes of

men who were named after them, and believed to be of their breed. Smith saw that this hypothesis threw light on much that was obscure in the Old Testament—in particular on the ritual taboos of the several codes of Hebrew legislation, and on the elaborate distinctions between clean and unclean. None but a totemistic reason accounts e.g. for the prohibition of the rock-badger; and the same may be said of the camel, the hare, and the swine. 'Les juifs pieux s'abstiennent de 'manger du porc, parce que leurs lointains ancêtres cinq ou six 'mille ans avant notre ère avaient pour *totem* le sanglier.' * And the curious precepts of Leviticus xi. 29–45, with which Ezekiel viii. 3–18 may be connected, become intelligible on this theory. The view that the forbidden animals were regarded as the property of the Deity only throws the question further back, for how came people to embrace so remarkable a view? †

The explanation of the faith is psychological. 'Totemism,' says an acute writer, 'is not so much a special social structure 'as a stage in epistemology. It is the reflexion of a very primi-'tive fashion in thinking, or rather feeling, the universe; a 'feeling the realization of which is essential to any understand-'ing of primitive religion. It is not a particular blunder and 'confusion made by certain ignorant savages, but a phase or 'stage of collective thinking through which the human mind is 'bound to pass.' ‡

That indications of these early beliefs should, as far as possible, have been effaced by the later revisers of the sacred books was to be expected: the first effort of a new stage of religion is to obliterate the traces of the old. But enough has been left to be suggestive. 'The Religion of the Semites,' while it owed much to Wellhausen's 'Reste arabischen 'Heidenthumes,' marked a new development of research in this direction. Its main contentions—(1) that all Semite, and indeed all primitive, religions have passed through a totemistic stage; and (2) that all later stages of the ritual of Semitic sacrifice can be explained as developments of this—are open to question, and are in fact controverted. But the wide diffusion

* Orpheus, p. 27.
† Cf. Encyclopaedia Biblica. Art. 'Clean and Unclean.'
‡ 'Themis.' J. E. Harrison. p. 122.

of totemism, and its influence as a factor in the production of later religious and social institutions, have passed out of the stage of hypothesis ; ' and this is a fact of incalculable impor- ' tance for all future research.' M. Salomon Reinach characteristically emphasises the bearing of this discussion on the sacramental teaching of the Christian Churches—for an acute criticism of his positions the reader may be referred to M. Loisy's ' À propos d'histoire des Religions ' *—and concludes his tribute to Smith's personal work by a reference to its brilliant development in the hands of a younger scholar : ' Genuit Frazerum ! ' It was to Smith that ' The Golden ' Bough ' was dedicated : and if the wide generalisations and sweeping hypotheses of that work fail not unfrequently to carry conviction to the reader, it is certain that its accumulation of material is a mine which the scholarship of many generations will fail to exhaust.

Smith himself, while endowed to the full with the freedom of the anthropological school with which so much of his latest and best work is identified, was singularly free from what, even to the friendly critic, may appear its prematurity and want of balance. ' Nothing was more striking in his intellectual ' history than the slow progress he made towards emancipation ' as a theologian, the almost obstinate conservatism with ' which he clung to the form of thought familiar to him in his ' youth.' The key to his mind on the ultimate questions of faith and life may be sought in the Hebrew text painted by him in the corner of the portrait reproduced as the frontispiece to his Life—' He that believeth shall not make haste.'

ALFRED FAWKES.

---

* Paris, E. Nourry, 1911.

HOME RULE ECONOMICS

1. **Is Home Rule Rome Rule?** By JOSEPH HOCKING. Ward, Lock and Co. 1912.
2. **The Nonconformist Treason.** By M. J. F. MCCARTHY. Blackwood and Sons. 1912.
3. **The Pope's Green Island.** By W. P. RYAN. Nisbet. 1912.
4. **The Framework of Home Rule.** By ERSKINE CHILDERS. Arnold. 1912.
5. **Home Rule.** By HAROLD SPENDER. Hodder and Stoughton. 1912.
6. **The Olive Branch in Ireland and its History.** By WILLIAM O'BRIEN, M.P. Macmillan and Co. 1912.
7. **The New Irish Constitution.** Edited on behalf of the Eighty Club by J. H. MORGAN, M.A. Hodder and Stoughton. 1912.
8. **Parliamentary Papers.** H.C. 220 and 221 of 1911 : Cd. 6153, 6154 (1912).

IN the above list of books we have a little parliament of authors more or less sincerely attempting to approach the Irish problem, but only three of them at most could ever reach it by the routes they have chosen, and two of these happen to be Roman Catholic Irishmen, the third an English Nonconformist. This meeting between Mr. Michael McCarthy, Mr. W. P. Ryan, and Mr. Joseph Hocking at the same point of clericalism ought to throw at least a negative light on the lines of the others which, produced ever so far either way, can never meet. The ' Olive Branch ' shows how to attempt peace martially, and how Irishmen's best desire to lift up their country falls short of their desire to knock each other down. Mr. Harold Spender leads us in two opposite directions for a goal which he cannot find in either. He sees ' Roman Catholicism ' in Ireland . . . a great national and democratic " force " ' : but this is early in the book, and, forgetting himself farther on, he writes ' The Pope holds Ireland in fee.' Mr. Spender appears to be equally sincere and enthusiastic at each of these and at many other opposite points of view, and the pretty play of double vision gives his book an interest peculiar to itself.

Mr. Hocking breaks the spell of negation, declaring that it is Rome Rule in Ireland now, that Home Rule could

not make Rome Rule more powerful than it is already, and that democracy is the antidote to ecclesiocracy. This rings true, but the issue must depend on how far ecclesiocracy can use democracy itself for its instrument. Demos imagines that he has representative government at Constantinople, but Turkish democracy makes no headway against Allah ; and while they have learnt to vote naval estimates at Tokio, the Imperial nexus of Japan is still a popular belief in the divine derivation of the Emperor's family pedigree. But ecclesiocracy both in Turkey and Japan is weaker and more subject to civil responsibility than it would be in a Home Rule Ireland. The Sheikh-ul-Islam, Turkey's Archbishop of Canterbury, lives and has his being under the shadow of the Sublime Porte, and has to temper his divinity to the human touch ; but the Home Rule Bill does not propose to bring the Pope to Dublin under local limitations, and if it did there might be objectors. Mr. McCarthy's indictment of British Protestantism implies the Romanisation of the Nonconformist conscience, and involves charges of deliberate betrayal. Mr. Ryan backs up Mr. McCarthy as to the national ruin resulting from Irish ecclesiasticism, but does it with much less inaccuracy than in his newspaper legends about Cardinal Logue's abolition of the ' Irish Peasant.' Both these clever Irishmen have been in person through the mill that grinds Ireland into papal pulp, and it gives their work a special value, even in spite of the crude style in the one case and the quest for pagan dreams in the other.

' The Framework of Home Rule ' is a serious work, and the only one of much constitutional value that we have so far seen on the Home Rule side. The production of this book is justified alone by the sincere thoroughness of its research into the record of constitutional growth and colonial precedent within the Empire ; but then, if the author is right in his essential definition of Home Rule as derived from his research, it follows that the Government's Home Rule Bill is not worth a diseased potato—a fact which has farther value in the refusal of the Government to adopt their own Committee's recommendations, which, we understand, are practically identical with those of Mr. Childers, who, judging from his book, must regard the present Bill as depriving Ireland of the means to make Home Rule a success. The same consideration applies to the

conclusions arrived at by the Government's own experts in Sir Henry Primrose's Committee. On the subjective side of his task, by far the most important, Mr. Childers has failed remarkably. The psychology of the problem, which is its foundation and more than half its superstructure, is lost in his elaborate logic of constitutional history. He does not reach the Irish mind nor the influences that shape it as the primary seat of the Irish political aberrations which have perennially puzzled the statesman, and kept a full-grown scheme of constitutional democracy practically inoperative in Ireland for more than half a century. Mr. Childers' mental method is English, and the Irish mind cannot be reached by English logic. In this, however, Mr. Childers shares the common disability of the others, who combine almost uniformly in failing to see the mental influences and conditions which account for the economic disablement of the Irish Home Rulers and their consequent decay in every department of life that can be economically influenced.

The Home Rule economists confine themselves to questions of State revenue and expenditure—a small fraction of the economic field, and, at that, instructive chiefly as an index. The index is mistaken for what it ought to indicate, the weathercock becomes the cause of the wind, the part contains the whole, and the State becomes the sole measure of economic values. Politicians accept the scheme, and proceed to legislation.

Yet this aboriginal notion of the State is natural enough in a country where socialism has half realised itself unconsciously among a people who, while scandalised at the sound of socialism under the Pope's condemnation of it, commit themselves to socialism at a much more rapid rate than in countries where the socialist is permitted to erect a free platform. Irishmen make the State their industrial capitalist, and openly blame it for any refusal of the function, looking on any rise or fall in industry as a mere affair of government. Meantime ' they stone ' their economists,' as Sir Horace Plunkett points out. The evil of all this elaborate inversion goes deep into the Irish character, and is largely maintained to disguise Irish failure as a British responsibility, ' the State ' being still in Irish eyes a British institution. But the real causes are neither British nor Irish, except in so far as they are conciliated by the statesmanship and accommodated by the legislation of the United Kingdom.

This curious but great increase of Irish socialism, in an age and within a region of intense individualism, results from the twenty years' policy of 'killing Home Rule with kindness' and 'managing the Irish through the priests.' The 'kindness' to kill Home Rule could come only from the State, and could not but set up the State in the popular mind as a sort of economic saviour assuring salvation by faith alone, without works, good or even middling. To perfect the process, and to guarantee the fruit true to the tree, the priest promptly took his very golden opportunity and put himself forward as the link between the citizen and the State. The result is an instructive combination of Church and State to advance that very socialism which the Church formally condemns as immoral, and which the State regards as a supreme danger to civilisation.

Should the Irish people have the misfortune to indulge in an attempt at self-government under these sacerdo-socialistic conditions when the purse of that fairy godmother the British Government is withdrawn, there will be a painful awakening from illusions, and probably an upheaval against both Church and State more dangerous to piety and peace than anything we have seen in Ireland since 'the management of the Irish 'through the priests' began. The popular mind is not yet aware that its political and spiritual guides have bankrupted 'the holy cause of Ireland' by a sacerdotal elaboration of socialistic expenditure at the expense hitherto of 'the heretic 'Saxon.' But a Home Rule exchequer, necessarily increasing Irish taxation above the present rates, could not be long at work without revealing the vast insolvency in the most unmistakable of all ways, even with £5,500,000 going from British into Irish pockets every year. Besides, this Irish socialism is much worse than any variety recommended by men like Mr. Shaw or Karl Marx, because it means State ownership and control in the means of production, with the priests in control of the State, and with every priest necessarily a foreigner, if he is in the least faithful to the canons of his Church and to his solemn oath of loyalty to a State outside of and essentially opposed to the realm he lives in. How can Home Rule deal with such forces, as profoundly effective as their subtlety makes them irresponsible to the standards of civil statesmanship? The case of Ireland is primarily a problem in psychology,

a matter of adjusting mind to the needs of life ; and Acts of Parliament, even when they are the product of the Nonconformist conscience, are far too crude to touch the essential significance of such a situation.

The people of England and Scotland have no idea as to how far, or how effectively, socialism has advanced in Ireland.

The fixed capital in agriculture, such as fences, out-houses, and drainage, provided in England mainly by the private landowner, is coming to be provided in Ireland very largely by the State through two or three State departments, the chief of which, known as the Congested Districts Board, is now, alike in its statutory direction and in its administrative ethics, practically an ecclesiastical institution with a bishop as its undisputed master. In every direction among the Irish Home Rulers State socialism advances rapidly, but at no point without the priest advancing as rapidly on top of it, which at least doubles every evil attributable to the growth of socialism elsewhere. Where mental freedom in democratic development is permitted to provide a critical function in the social organism, there may be some check on State control in the means of production, but not where the priest keeps democracy organised ' to stone the economist.'

There is something much worse for the Home Rulers than this socialistic tendency and its actual extent ; for it further leads them to expect of the State what the State cannot possibly give anywhere in the civilised world, and what the State will be more powerless to provide under Irish Home Rule than anywhere else when the British purse has been cut off. To a people like the English and Scotch, who have through individual freedom achieved an extremely high efficiency in their economic and social life, there may be a harmless charm for an idle hour in the indulgence of a sentimental reaction, building abstract theories of economic reversion to that primitive ease which is but the longing of organic weakness for protection at the expense of the strong. But the Irish, Ulster apart, have never been permitted to develop any such efficiency, and if they have so far enjoyed the pleasure of it without the pain, that has been by making people pay for it on the other side of St. George's Channel.

From these general considerations, though they are infinitely

more important than the details of government finance, let us now turn to the financial proposals of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Redmond. Their bill confesses a Home Rule deficit of more than £2,000,000 a year, but the figure has been reached by methods which no honest accountant would for a moment sanction. Nobody knows how much the debit balance on the Home Rule account may be increased by the cost of the Insurance Act; therefore nobody knows how much too little is the margin of £500,000 a year charged to Great Britain as a surplus buffer to ease the shocks of established insolvency. And this is but an instance. The insurance item is the smallest in the undetermined lump of varying quantities in the established deficit.

The bill tries to make it appear that the £2,000,000 a year will be the total cost of Ireland under Home Rule to the British taxpayer, and, as if to secure the illusion, there is an academic provision to reduce the surplus buffer by small instalments 'until it disappears.' But in arriving at the £2,000,000 several large items, definitely known on the debit side, have been deliberately omitted, though there is as much reason to include any of these as there is to include any that appear. There is not a word about Ireland's national debt, not even about the amount of it she brought with her into the amalgamation of the exchequers, the interest on which, under Home Rule, stands to be paid by the British taxpayer every year, with the Redmond parliament free to magnify the glories of Grattan while evading the 'national' responsibilities inherited from his 'independent' parliament. There is not a word as to what adequate defences would cost Ireland as a Sovereign State. A small fraction of that probable cost is sufficient under the Union, with the securest protection in the world, but there is not a word even about this small fraction, and Ireland does not contribute a cent to it, either now or under the Home Rule Bill. Has 'nationhood' ever before been attempted on such a footing?

It is not as if the facts about the Irish national debt were unknown. Gladstone recognised it as a serious factor, and devised his Home Rule finance on that footing. The suppression of it now in the Irish balance sheet, charging permanently a large Irish liability on British taxpayers, and without letting them know, is clearly in the nature of obtaining money under

false pretences, and might result in the imprisonment of anybody attempting it, unless a cabinet minister.

True, the Irish debt has a rather crooked history; but that is no reason for imposing the cost of it on the British behind their backs. Before her parliamentary 'independence' Ireland had practically no national debt. In 1754 she discharged it absolutely, a rare achievement anywhere; but in those days Irishmen assumed that a State ought to pay its way out of the pockets of those who incurred the expenditure, and they declined to impose the burden of a permanently funded debt on their posterity.

Just before the beginning of the Grattan parliament in 1782 the Irish debt was still considerably under two millions, and still reasonably regarded as a temporary obligation, well within the resources of the revenue to discharge it absolutely as before on the incidence of a few years. Thus the Irish exchequer was conducted on the ethics of an honourable private household, borrowing no more than could be repaid out of current income, and refusing to put the children in pawn for the sins of the fathers. But when Grattan's glorious eloquence at College Green ceased in the year 1800 Ireland was left with a national debt permanently funded, amounting to over £32,000,000, and contracted in their eighteen years of 'independence' solely by 'the King, Lords, and Commons 'of Ireland' under the Constitution of the Irish parliament. What could be a more exclusively Irish obligation?

The only possible question that can arise is as to how far this Irish debt was incurred for imperial purposes as the result of free votes in money and men granted by the Irish parliament for wars waged in the interest of both peoples. Such assistance was voted by the Irish parliament again and again. We have not complete evidence of an accurate total for the eighteen years, but in so far as we have evidence it shows that Ireland's contribution was far below her proportion, and much farther below what would have been her need as a sovereign State in the conditions and circumstances of the time. In any case, it was the exclusive obligation of Ireland, as incurred and approved by 'the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland,' never since discharged, and now deliberately ignored by British statesmen to accommodate a contrivance for constitutional revision in the United Kingdom.

The obligation is not limited to those £32,000,000. Seventeen years after the Grattan parliament passed away the Irish debt exceeded £112,000,000. The Act of Union provided for the ultimate amalgamation of the two exchequers, but did not amalgamate them. In the meantime Ireland contributed to the joint services at the rate of £1 Irish to £7 10s. British. The Napoleonic wars were then at their worst, and the burden upon Irish revenues was greater than Ireland could bear. Year after year, the Irish exchequer had to borrow heavily to meet the deficiency of revenue. In 1817 the hopeless bankruptcy of the Irish exchequer forced the statesmen on both sides to bring about the amalgamation of the two exchequers as contemplated, but not executed, by the Act of Union. At the time of the Union it had not been anticipated that this amalgamation would be needed so soon. The idea then was that, in fairness to Ireland, the British debt should be brought down to the level of the Irish before completing the partnership; but our dual exchequer could not measure Napoleon in the compass of its book-keeping, and soon after the peace of 1815 Ireland stood with her revenue less than half her expenditure, borrowing the other half. That could not continue, and it was for the relief of Ireland, not for the profit of England, that the parliament of the United Kingdom decided to proceed without further delay to the amalgamation of the two exchequers.

The British public has been imposed upon by this crooked business in another way. Because the Act of Union fixed the proportion between Irish and British contributions at two to fifteen, and because that proportion proved greater than Ireland's power to pay, Great Britain now stands charged with a century of persistent 'plunder,' and this charge is used as a justification for a proposal to finance for all time an Irish parliament out of British revenue, while hiding Irish obligations out of sight to accommodate the contrivance. Let us examine what really happened. No matter what the amount of the Union error, the excess resulting from it in Irish contributions lasted only seventeen years. The Act of 1816 which amalgamated the exchequers in 1817 required the imperial purse to take over a business bankrupt by fifty per cent.; to meet all Irish charges as they stood; and to accept from Ireland only such revenue as could be collected on the existing

incidence, still somewhat lower than in Great Britain, but tending to uniformity. Separate accounts then ceased to be kept, but the obvious effect of amalgamation, at least to begin with, was to make Great Britain responsible for an Irish loss, and on such a footing as to reduce the Irish contribution for joint purposes from two to fifteen to something like one to fifteen.

Turn back again to those seventeen years, during which the Irish debt, under the Union, ran up from 32 to 112 millions. The British rate of increase in the same years was far less, because, with somewhat higher rates of taxation, the rate of the expenditure in common was more within the limit of Britain's higher taxable capacity, leaving need to borrow less. Lord Castlereagh's miscalculation of two to fifteen is commonly described as a deliberate scheme of 'plunder,' but the sole ground for this charge is that he failed to produce documentary evidence which he had promised showing statistical and other data for his adjustment. We have much better evidence for a contrary conclusion. Economic vision and media of judgment were still almost in their infancy. To ascertain comparative taxable capacity, Lord Castlereagh admittedly relied almost solely on population, foreign trade, and consumption of taxable products; but we know now how insufficient are such data by themselves to determine the taxable capacity of a people, though many statesmen since that time have defended far-reaching conclusions on no better evidence. Lord Castlereagh's methods were those of his time, and on their merits he was generous to Ireland rather than unjust. For instance, the Irish population was considerably in excess of his proportionment for their comparative contribution.

It is perfectly clear from the events that the proportion fixed by the Act of Union was greater than Ireland could bear. But she never did bear it. As has been shown above, the annual Irish deficiency arising from this scale was added to the Irish debt, and in 1817 that debt was merged in the joint national debt of the United Kingdom. The continued repetition of the baseless charge that Ireland was 'robbed' is all the more scandalous because the facts are so clearly brought out in the report of the Financial Relations Commission (1894 to 1896), which is the very Bible of the men who accuse England of robbing Ireland, in order to make out a case for a scheme

of Home Rule in which Ireland will rob England. One of the most distinguished of the living members of the commission, Lord Welby, has contributed a paper on Financial Relations to the volume of essays on Home Rule published by the Eighty Club. Although Lord Welby is an enthusiastic Home Ruler, and although his party loyalty leads him to back any proposal that a Liberal government may make, his intellectual honesty prevents him from giving his assent to the sheer nonsense that some members of his party have talked. Dealing with this particular point, he says: 'Much time has been wasted in 'criticising that provision of the Act of Union which fixed the 'respective contributions of Great Britain and Ireland to the 'common purposes of the empire at the proportion of fifteen 'to two. That proportion in fact was not exacted, and may 'be put aside as theoretical.' This judgment, with the facts on which it rests, is a complete reply to the whole fabric of fallacy erected upon the alleged quasi-criminal blunder of the authors of the Act of Union, who, with the best evidence available at the time, fixed a proportion which might possibly have served if there had been no Napoleonic wars, and had the Irish permitted themselves to grow in the economic efficiencies which enable nations to pay taxes.

The difference each year between the sum which Ireland was required to pay under the Act of Union and the sum which she actually did pay, was added to the Irish debt, which in 1817, as already explained, was incorporated in the national debt of the United Kingdom. When, however, we come to estimate Ireland's true indebtedness it is clearly necessary to make an allowance for the amount due to Lord Castlereagh's scale of two to fifteen, and a sum which may generously be put at about £50,000,000 must, therefore, be written off the total debt of £112,000,000 with which Ireland was chargeable upon the amalgamation of the exchequers in 1817. When this has been done, we have still left £62,000,000, a strictly Irish obligation now costing the taxpayers of Great Britain £1,550,000 a year, and having cost considerably more for over sixty years, until the Goschen conversion brought down the interest on Consols.

That this figure of £62,000,000 is well within the mark will be seen by comparing the debt created after the Union with that created by Grattan's parliament before the Union. The

Grattan standard is always good for a Home Ruler; let us apply it here. In the eighteen years from 1782 to 1800 the Grattan parliament added £30,000,000 to the debt of Ireland (which was previously under £2,000,000), although during a large part of that period the country was at peace. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that at the very least an equal sum would have been added in the seventeen years of almost incessant war which followed the Union. Thus, on the Grattan standard, we arrive at £62,000,000 as the very lowest sum which can fairly be treated as the purely Irish debt on the amalgamation of the exchequers in 1817.

While the debt was multiplied by more than sixteen, the revenue was not multiplied by so much as two, and the evidence suggests increased taxation as the cause of the comparatively small increase in revenue, rather than an increased yield from unaltered incidence indicating increased prosperity. It is plain that the Grattan 'prosperity' must have been mainly borrowed.

Before the Grattan 'independence' Irishmen had clamoured long against excessive pensions; at the end of it, they had considerably enlarged the pension list. During these eighteen years of 'unprecedented prosperity' the College Green orators appear to have borrowed more than the total revenue collected, and we have no serious evidence of increased prosperity until after the enactment of the Union, when the population nearly doubled itself in less than half a century.

Let us once for all dispose of the contention that Ireland has been 'robbed' during the period of the amalgamation of the exchequers from 1817 onwards. The very statement of this contention implies a fallacy. The taxes raised in Ireland are not paid by any collectivity to which the name Ireland can be applied; they are paid by a number of individual Irishmen, and the real question to be asked is whether these individual Irishmen, or any of them, have been compelled to pay a higher rate of taxation than Englishmen or Scotchmen in corresponding circumstances, and whether the unitary assessment affected the two peoples unequally. The answer is emphatically in the negative. In the first case, several of the taxes levied in England and Scotland are not even now levied in Ireland, notably the old land tax, the inhabited house duty, the railway passenger duty, and above all the local rates for

primary education. Of the remaining taxes levied in the United Kingdom, there is not one which is levied at a higher rate in Ireland than elsewhere. Thus, so far from residents in Ireland being 'robbed' since the amalgamation of the exchequers, they have been—especially in the matter of local rates—and are still, taxed at a lower rate than residents in England and Scotland. On this aspect of the question Lord Welby, though extremely anxious to make out a case for the present Home Rule Bill, speaks emphatically. He says in the article just referred to :

'A plea is often put forward that England is a rich country, and Ireland a poor country, and it is argued that identical taxation therefore wrongs Ireland. But England is not a rich country, in the broad sense. It is a country in which there is vast accumulation of wealth, but in which, also, there is a great mass of poverty—poverty probably exceeding the poverty of Ireland—and therefore identical taxation, if it wrongs the poor of Ireland, wrongs still more the poor of England.'

Here Lord Welby appears to have said the right thing in the wrong way. The conditions of Ireland, as compared with those of Great Britain, indicate more poverty but less actual destitution. A smaller proportion of the Irish are unable to find something to eat, but a vastly larger proportion are incapable of a comfortable and progressive standard of living. Take, for instance, the nine counties in Congestion, with the average family income on the land probably less than £25 a year. More than half of what is outside Congestion differs little from what is inside, and we have no such extended scale of poverty anywhere in Great Britain. Here is where inequality of power to pay results in over-taxation, with practically the whole population over large areas on these little incomes, and paying the same *rates* of taxation on articles of every-day use as the vast multitude in Great Britain on incomes of £100 a year and over. In several of the most advanced countries, and for nearly a century, the principle has been admitted of reckoning in the economic justice of taxation not only the amount paid but also the amount which the family have to live on when they have paid it ; and when this is taken into account we can see the comparative sacrifice in paying a tax of 5*d*. in the pound on tea from an income of £100 a year and paying the same rate of 5*d*. from an income of 9*s*. a week.

In this sense, but in this sense only, Ireland is overtaxed. In the matter of local rates, she is rather undertaxed. Her overtaxation results from no unfairness of rates or laws, but from her own incapacity to pay, which is due to her own choice of economic disablement. Ireland is not alone an example of this regional differentiation. There are places in Great Britain suffering similarly, but not to the same extent. However, they have sense enough not to demand Home Rule, and conscience enough not to expect other people to pay for it.

Contrast the case of Scotland with practically the same population, but not with her 'moral centre of gravity fixed in a future 'existence,' as Sir Horace Plunkett describes his own countrymen. The figures are given in the House of Commons Paper No. 220 of 1911. In consequence of the financial disturbance created by the suspension of the Budget for the year 1909–10, the accounts for both the financial years 1909–10 and 1910–11 were disturbed; but the average of the two years gives a correct picture. The figures are as follows:

Average for years 1909–10 and 1910–11	England	Scotland	Ireland
	£	£	£
Revenue as contributed	138,168,000	17,049,000	9,931,000
Local expenditure	50,877,000	7,689,000	11,029,000
Surplus available for imperial expenditure	87,291,000	9,360,000	
Deficit	—	—	1,098,000

These figures show clearly that there is already an Irish deficit of over a million a year, with something like half a million more to be added to Irish insolvency when the Insurance Act is in full operation.

To return to Lord Welby. After further showing how heavily taxes on the necessaries of life, such as sugar, fall upon the poorest classes, both in Irish and in English towns, he adds: 'If then the poor of Ireland are to be relieved, the poor of 'England must be relieved also, and identical taxation would 'still be the result.'

This argument by a strong Home Ruler is in itself a complete reply to the talk of 'robbing,' but lest any point should be omitted let us concede for the sake of argument that even after amalgamation of the exchequers it was still possible to treat Ireland as a separate entity. On that hypothesis it would clearly become necessary to take account not only of what Ireland pays, but also of what Ireland receives. Yet by an extraordinary feat of intellectual audacity Nationalist orators coolly assume that Ireland ought to be treated as a separate entity for purposes of taxation and as a part of the United Kingdom for purposes of expenditure. If the aggregate of the taxes paid by Irishmen, as compared with the corresponding aggregate for Great Britain, exceeds the proportion required by the relative wealth of the two islands, then they say 'Ireland is robbed,' although simultaneously Ireland, treated as an entity, may have been drawing far more than her due proportion out of the common exchequer. This is an impossible position to take up. If Ireland is to be treated as a separate entity, then a fair balance must be struck between what she has paid and what she has received.

The failure of Irishmen to see this obvious point is largely due to that honestly mischievous document known as 'The 'Report of the Financial Relations Commission,' 1894–96. The terms of reference were wide enough. Proceeding on the same principle as Lord Castlereagh and other inquirers since his time, but with vastly increased and more accurate data for judgment, the Majority Report found a heavy over-taxation of Ireland, as calculated on the standard of comparative taxable capacity, putting the two national incomes as one to twenty, whereas their comparative contributions in actual revenue at the time stood as one to thirteen. With the same system and incidence or rates of taxation in both countries, one country had been advancing economically, her comparative power to pay exceeding her payments; the other country had been receding, her payments exceeding her power. The data for an accurate result on the whole are still inconclusive. Take, for instance, the striking differences in the distribution of Irish income as compared with British—something like half the whole population of Ireland on family incomes which could hardly exceed the earnings of the average agricultural labourer in England. The commissioners could not take in a calculation

like that, important as it was and is still. Then there are questions about Irish savings idle in savings banks, which, used as Irish industrial capital instead, would mean higher taxable capacity; and about Ireland's curiously large and increasing foreign trade, which might be diminished with economic and fiscal advantage by an increased consumption of Irish products at home and a diminished importation of the inferior values now imported in exchange for them. Quite a large body of data which is commonly taken in this way to indicate taxable capacity may be, and sometimes actually is, an indication of taxable incapacity. That, however, is not the most serious mischief done by our Financial Relations Commission.

The Majority Report sets out Ireland's 'over-taxation' since the Union, thus derived, in terms of money, per annum and total; and, so far, all right, minus the factor of defective data: but then these accumulated balances of nearly a century are left to appear as an accusing pile of Imperial 'plunder' without one word to explain the economic cleavage and the hidden causes by which the Irish disable themselves industrially, while the British, in free possession of their faculties, advance in the efficiencies of economic life, taxable capacity included. For nearly two generations after the Union, Ireland still continued to move upward with the rest of the United Kingdom; but the Commissioners could not measure in money the forces which prevented Ireland from keeping step with the industrial development of Great Britain. Taken literally, and without regard to their economic causes, the commissioners' figures would infer vast intentional misgovernment of Ireland by the British; taken with their causes, they illustrate a vast disablement of the Irish under foreign influences which the Irish chose to obey, and which the British left them to deal with as their own affair. The responsibility is ecclesiastical, but the ecclesiastic makes it political, and now the Home Rule Bill would make the British pay for it permanently, without the smallest guarantee to emancipate the Irish from their ecclesiastical disablement in the economic sphere.

The Financial Relations Commission, excellent at arithmetic, totted up the yearly items of 'excess' Irish taxation since the Union, but made no attempt to see the excess disablement of the Irish which alone accounted for it. The total for the

time came out at more than £300,000,000, ever since called 'Imperial plunder.' The scope of the fallacy thus imposed on the unsuspecting public can easily be seen from the fact that if we write off these £300,000,000 Ireland has not contributed a cent to army, navy, or any other Imperial service for more than a hundred years.

If we assume, as honest men are bound to do, that it is and always has been the duty of Irishmen to make a fair contribution to the common expenditure of the kingdom, the whole basis for this vast superstition about the over-taxation of Ireland vanishes completely. It is true that during a very brief period in the middle of the last century Ireland's effective contribution to Imperial expenditure was very substantial. This arose from the fact that a very large revenue was derived from the taxation of articles of popular consumption in Ireland at a time when public expenditure upon Irish purposes was extremely meagre, and when the Irish population was much larger than it is now. But the balance thus temporarily secured has since been more than wiped out by the growth of expenditure on purely Irish purposes out of the common exchequer, and for many years past Ireland has been making an increasingly inadequate contribution to the cost of the army and navy, and none at all to the interest upon the national debt and other common charges of the common kingdom. Since the end of the financial year 1908–9 there has been no net contribution from Ireland to Imperial expenditure, but, on the contrary, a rapidly growing contribution from Great Britain to the purely local expenditure of Ireland. When these considerations have been taken into account, it will be found that all the talk about the robbing of Ireland is an impudent fiction. On the whole, Ireland has made a substantial profit out of her fiscal union with Great Britain.

But if the partnership is to be dissolved, and if 'Ireland 'a nation' is to be entitled to the least scrap of national self-respect, then the financial relations between the two countries, which will then be true separate entities, must charge each country with her own real costs. What is actually proposed is to end the union and to continue Ireland's financial privileges under it at the expense of the British.

This Irish obligation was fully recognised by Mr. Gladstone

in both of his Home Rule Bills. It was fully admitted by the Nationalist members who accepted those Bills. In the Bill of 1886 Mr. Gladstone proposed that Ireland's contribution to Imperial charges should be on the basis of one to fifteen, and the figures, according to the official calculation published with the Bill, worked out as follows :

PROPOSED IRISH CONTRIBUTION UNDER BILL OF 1886.

Debt charges	£1,466,000
Army and navy	1,666,000
Civil government	110,000
	£3,242,000

It is needless to comment upon this scheme ; for the Bill, in consequence of the revolt of the Liberal Unionists, was rejected by the House of Commons on second reading. In 1893 Mr. Gladstone proposed two schemes. Under the first the whole of the Irish customs revenue, estimated at £2,400,000, would have been impounded to meet Imperial charges, plus any excess charge for the Irish constabulary beyond the sum of £1,000,000. This first scheme was abandoned because it was found to have been based upon erroneous figures, and a totally new scheme was produced. The second scheme of 1893 provided that one third of the ' true ' revenue of Ireland should be apportioned to the Imperial authority to cover Ireland's contribution to Imperial expenditure, plus one third of the cost of the Irish police forces. On this plan, according to the official calculation, the Imperial authority would have received for the purposes stated £2,262,000 from the Irish taxpayer. Sir William Harcourt, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking on the 24th of July 1893, gave a slightly different figure. He said ' £2,276,000 is the contribution which we expect to be made ' by Ireland.'

These figures are instructive, but even more important is the principle upon which they were based. This was defined in two speeches by Mr. Gladstone. On the 13th of February 1893 he said : ' The principle to which we are bound ' to give effect is that Ireland is bound to bear her fair share ' of Imperial expenditure.' On April 6 of the same year he said : ' We propose to fix the Irish contribution at a little ' over 4 per cent.'

Is that or is it not still a fair proportion? The Financial Relations Commission in 1894–96 indicated that even a higher proportion—namely, one-twentieth or 5 per cent.—would not necessarily have been unfair. Since then the wealth of Great Britain has grown much more than Ireland's. To be on the safe side, let us put the present proportion at one to thirty—a proportion of which no Irishman can complain. Next, what are the items to be included in the category of Imperial expenditure? We have dealt above with the question of the purely Irish debt. Some Irishmen will possibly argue that this debt was finally merged in the debt of the United Kingdom in 1817, and that it is impossible to undo what was then done; but if they use that argument they cannot also repudiate responsibility for their share of the present Imperial debt and the joint borrowing since 1817. Therefore, for the sake of simplicity of reckoning, and also for the sake of giving every point possible in favour of Ireland, we will assume that the purely Irish debt of £62,000,000 has vanished and that Ireland is now only responsible for one-thirtieth of the joint national debt, or about £23,000,000. Comparing the figures of the House of Commons Paper No. 220 of 1911 (Revenue and Expenditure, England, Scotland, and Ireland) with the Budget estimates for the current year, we find that roughly the Imperial expenditure for the year 1912–13 will be as follows:

Imperial Expenditure for 1912–13.

Debt charge	£24,500,000
Army	27,860,000
Navy	44,085,000
Civil government and packet services as in 1910–11	7,503,000
Total	£103,948,000

The thirtieth part of this sum is £3,465,000.

It will be observed that no allowance has been made for the almost certain increase in military and naval expenditure for the defence of Ireland as much as for the defence of Great Britain. If Ireland were a sovereign state her defences alone would cost far more than the whole of her present revenue, and nobody can calculate what increase the defence of Ireland under Home Rule conditions may not cost.

Let us, however, take the figure £3,465,000 as it is. To it must be added the admitted local deficit on the working of the proposed Irish Government—namely, £2,015,000. We thus reach a total of 5,480,000*l.*, or in round figures five and a-half millions, as the very lowest annual sum which Home Rule Ireland will cost to the taxpayers of Great Britain if the proposals of his Majesty's Ministers and of the Nationalist Party in the House of Commons are carried out. The men who have prated so loudly of 'Ireland a nation' are not ashamed now to proclaim Ireland a pauper. The British people are to pay five and a-half millions a year for the privilege of superimposing the canon law over the king's liberty in Ireland.

CONTEMPORARY POLITICS

Debates in Parliament.
The Daily Press.

THE outstanding fact in contemporary politics is the indifference of the public to the proceedings of parliament —an indifference marked in so many ways that it would be superfluous to quote evidence in support of the fact. Everybody is conscious of it, and a good many people occasionally comment upon it. But the indifference is extending so far that even comment upon it becomes rare.

And yet seldom has parliament been occupied with questions which by their nature are more likely to attract public attention. There is first the great question of Home Rule for Ireland. In 1886 and again in 1893 this question excited the passionate interest of the whole country. In the former year, owing to the revolt of the Liberal Unionists, the issue, as a subject for parliamentary debate, was disposed of in a comparatively brief period by the rejection of Mr. Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill upon its second reading. The country's approval of that rejection was pronounced at the ensuing general election. In 1893 the issue of Home Rule was more fully debated. The bill passed its second reading and was fought through Committee week after week through all the long summer and early autumn. During the whole of that time the House of Commons night after night was crowded with members following every point in a discussion which may, in comparison with recent debating in the House of Commons, be described as a debate of giants. The full reports daily given in the press were a proof of the interest of the public. At the end, late in September, the bill went up to the House of Lords ; and after six days' debate, which touched if possible a higher level than the long debates in the House of Commons, the Lords rejected the bill by a dramatic majority of 10 to 1.

It is safe to say that during the whole of this long discussion the interest of the public in the proceedings of parliament never flagged. The same issue is now before parliament, and not a soul apparently cares. Yet the present bill is in many ways more extensive, and certainly from almost every point of view a

worse bill, than either of its predecessors. There was a certain logical consistency in the bill of 1886 which proposed to give to Ireland what is popularly known as colonial self-government, and as a natural result removed all the Irish members from Westminster. That provision was bitterly opposed by many English Home Rulers, and notably by the late Mr. W. T. Stead, on the ground that it meant the disintegration of the kingdom. Taking note of this opposition, the bill of 1893 was framed so as to include eighty Irish members in the parliament of Westminster. Their inclusion under the provisions of that bill was justified not only as a means of preserving the parliamentary unity of the kingdom, but also because the Westminster parliament had power to impose taxation upon Ireland in the shape of customs duties, and the Imperial government was to obtain a very substantial revenue from that source. It was therefore in strict accordance with constitutional practice that the Irish should be represented in the Westminster parliament.

Under the new bill all excuse for Irish representation at Westminster disappears. The Westminster parliament will have no power of taxation in Ireland, and the government of the United Kingdom will derive no revenue from Ireland. On the contrary, it is Ireland that is to levy a tribute upon Great Britain. Yet Irish members to the number of 42 are to sit in the House of Commons, and are there to be free to offer their votes to the highest bidder whenever they wish to exact any additional tribute or other concessions from the government of Great Britain. This is not only a subversion of all constitutional practice but an outrage upon common sense. No man, who out of the generosity of his heart is subsidising a poor relation, would ever permit his dependant to control his banking account. It is unpleasant to have to use such plain language, but one of the extraordinary features of the present Home Rule Bill is the utter lack of self-respect shown by the Irish members in accepting a measure which implies the permanent pauperism of their country.

The other point in which the present bill is so markedly worse than its predecessors is with regard to customs revenue. In both the previous bills the power of imposing customs duties rested with the Imperial parliament. In the present bill Ireland obtains the right within specified limits to impose customs

duties of her own, and thus to break up the customs union between the two kingdoms which has existed for nearly three quarters of a century. It is perfectly true, as the apologists of the bill contend, that a customs union is not necessarily a feature of a federal union or even of an actual parliamentary union. It is also true that the practical advantages of a customs union are less when two countries are separated by the sea than when the only division between them is an impalpable land frontier. While, however, admitting both these points, it is impossible not to see that the power now conferred upon Ireland to create a separate customs tariff of her own, even though it is for the moment limited by restrictions which Irish protectionists will certainly resent, must create a greater division between the two islands than either of the previous bills proposed, and must result in a serious interruption to that intimate economic intercourse which has been built up so notably within the last generation.

In this connexion it is worth while incidentally to take note of an extraordinary statement made by Mr. Herbert Samuel in defending the government bill on May 7 in the House of Commons. Mr. Samuel said : ' Great Britain and Ireland is ' the only case of two islands separated by the sea forming ' members of one federation.' How so able and painstaking a minister could have committed himself to such a glaring inaccuracy as this it is difficult to understand. The first obvious answer which springs to the mind is the case of Australia and Tasmania. Instances equally relevant to the sense of Mr. Samuel's argument are the cases of Italy and Sicily, France and Corsica, Canada and Vancouver. There is, in fact, neither on historic grounds nor on economic grounds, any reason whatever why an island should not be politically united with a larger island or with a continent.

This brings us naturally to the one issue which nas excited perhaps more interest even in England than any other phase of the present Home Rule Bill, namely, Ulster's resolute refusal to accept the measure. In the earlier stages of the controversy several prominent ministers hinted plainly that they were willing to consider the case of Ulster. They have been over-ruled by a stronger force. There is to be no consideration for Ulster : nor is there to be any consideration for a principle which the Liberal party has in the past been proud to uphold

and which forms the only plausible excuse for the bill itself. Throughout their existence as a separate party the Liberals and their predecessors the Whigs have maintained the principle that where separate national feeling exists it is right to give expression to that feeling by means of a separate government. We have only to look back to the concessions made to French Nationalist feeling in Canada by Lord Durham, the enthusiasm of English Liberals for the liberation of Italy from Austrian rule, and to their concession of self-government to the Boers of the Transvaal both after Majuba and after Bloemfontein. In none of these cases would any Liberal have dreamed of advancing the plea that it was impossible to recognise national feeling unless some geographical or geological boundary presented itself between the 'people rightly struggling to be free' and the 'tyrants wishing to enslave them.' Yet now it is proposed to hand over a portion of Ulster, in which there is a very distinct separate national feeling, to a government to be constituted in Dublin out of the rest of Ireland. With every desire to be charitable it is only possible to explain this violation of Liberal principles by assuming that Mr. Redmond, who can determine the fate of the government in the present House of Commons, has refused to accept any scheme of Home Rule unless he and his friends are permitted to govern and to tax Protestant Ulster which loathes the prospect of his rule. There is no constitutional or practical difficulty in the way of giving to every Irish county the right to decide by popular vote whether it will become a county of Ireland for the purposes of the Home Rule Bill or a county of England. It is not suggested that this would solve the Home Rule problem, for there would still remain in the southern counties of Ireland a number of Protestants subjected to what they fear would be an intolerant Catholic rule; but the permission given to an Irish county to remain in union with Protestant England rather than to be subjected to Catholic Ireland would undoubtedly diminish the injustice of the bill.

The second bill of the session is certainly not so serious as the Home Rule Bill, but still raises very important issues. The Church in Wales is part of the Church of England, and the proposal to disestablish the Welsh dioceses, if carried, must shake the general position of the English Church. That Church possesses an enormous number of adherents who in earlier years would certainly have expressed more emphatically than they

have done on this occasion their indignation at the Government scheme of disestablishment and disendowment.

Finally, there is a new Franchise Bill, suddenly introduced into the House of Commons when half the normal session was already over. In other years franchise bills have probably attracted more interest than almost any other legislative measures. But nobody in the House or out of it seems to regard this new bill as a matter for serious discussion, although it will add 2,000,000 male voters to the present electorate, and although it raises in an acute form the whole question of women's suffrage.

What then is the cause of this general indifference to the proceedings of parliament? We believe that the ultimate cause is the profound disbelief of the public in the sincerity of politicians. Nine men out of ten when they trouble to talk about politics at all will say cynically that the politicians are only playing a game of their own, and will imply that this consideration makes it useless for intelligent men to take politics seriously.

There is good ground for this cynicism. Take, first, Home Rule. A couple of years ago, when the fate of the House of Lords was still in the balance, the Unionists were anxious to come to some kind of arrangement with their opponents, and articles were written with a view to tentatively suggesting some kind of federal scheme of government which would satisfy the Irish demand for Home Rule. It may be that these schemes differed very greatly from either of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills as well as from the Asquith-Redmond Bill. But the public does not grasp these subtleties. When these articles appeared a considerable section of the public remembered that the Unionist party came into existence to uphold the union, and the spectacle of Unionist newspapers and Unionist politicians advocating some form of Home Rule disillusioned men who had been convinced by previous Unionist arguments that Home Rule meant the disintegration of the kingdom and the disruption of the empire. The influence of the disillusionment still remains. It is impossible for men who remember such letters as those of 'Pacificus' to believe as fully as before in the sincerity of the Unionist party on the Home Rule question.

There is an equal appearance of insincerity in the Liberal treatment of the question. During the period when the Liberals

were somewhat anxious to get rid of the embarrassing heritage which they had received from Mr. Gladstone, they modified their language with regard to Home Rule, and talked of some scheme of general devolution which could be equally applicable to all portions of the kingdom. So far was this change of attitude carried that the Prime Minister himself more than once declared that Irish Home Rule must be based on a federal principle which could be applied all round. The failure to carry out this pledge is apparent. In the first place, if the Liberals had honestly meant to create a federal system they would have shaped their bill so as to deal with Scotland, Wales, and England simultaneously with Ireland. There would have been no greater constitutional difficulty in thus dealing with the matter as a whole than in dealing with it piecemeal. On the contrary, if we are to judge by the experience of other countries, there would have been less difficulty in this complete treatment of the problem; for never before has any country proposed to give to one portion of its territory the beginnings of a federal constitution while leaving the rest of the country to be governed in its local concerns by the remnant of an Imperial parliament. But the conclusive proof that Liberals have broken with their pledges upon this point is found in the many provisions of the Irish Home Rule Bill which are obviously inapplicable to other portions of the kingdom.

How is it possible for any Englishman who takes his politics seriously still to continue to feel respect for parliament when its prominent men on both sides are thus apparently indifferent to their previous pledges? As a particular illustration, one may take the case of Colonel Seely—on all personal grounds one of the most highly respected members of the House of Commons—who only as recently as 1905 when standing for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool declared that he would not support Home Rule until the north and south of Ireland could agree together upon a Home Rule scheme.

The position with regard to the Welsh Disestablishment Bill raises slightly different but analogous considerations. There was a time when the separation of Church from State was regarded as an essential part of the creed of all advanced Liberals. So enthusiastically was this principle upheld in the middle of the last century that Liberal Nonconformists were

then opposed to the State undertaking any part in the work of national education, because they dreaded lest State education should lead to State religion. That view has been abandoned, and the Liberal Nonconformists have in more recent years not only been willing to accept State religion but have clamoured for the establishment of such a religion, under the name of 'Cowper Templeism,' in every elementary school. Having advanced to this point, it is clearly impossible for Liberals to feel the same enthusiasm for separating the Church from the State that their fathers felt, and obviously they do not feel it. The Welsh Disestablishment Bill is introduced not in obedience to a general Liberal demand but solely at the bidding of a little knot of somewhat embittered Welsh Nonconformists, who have the advantage of being supported in the Cabinet by one of their own countrymen. The bill may be regarded as the outcome of ancient animosities rather than the expression of modern tendencies; and in order to give special emphasis to the animosity the Nonconformists behind the bill insist, contrary to the general weight of Liberal opinion in the House of Commons, upon extorting £170,000 a year from the revenues of an extremely poor Church, at a time when the revenues of the State amount to £187,000,000 a year.

With regard to the Franchise Bill, it is sufficient to say that even its authors do not disguise the fact that the measure is intended to give an electoral benefit to their party by the abolition of plural voting. The phrase 'One man, one vote' upon which the bill is based has no meaning at all unless each vote has an equal value. It is, indeed, even more unfair that a man should have the equivalent of a plural vote by living in one over-represented constituency than that he should have a number of separate votes by virtue of a bona-fide residence in separate constituencies. In the latter case his interests are spread, and it is not necessarily unjust that he should be entitled to give expression to them in each of the places where they exist. In the former case nothing excuses the anomaly except the fact that it is historical. That fact, however, is an insufficient defence, for the country has already had three redistribution bills within a century, and if a further instalment of electoral reform is necessary, it should include redistribution as well as franchise reform. The only reason for avoiding redistribution at the present time is the same reason that determines so much

of the policy of the Government—that it would be unpalatable to the Irish Nationalist members and consequently inconvenient to the present ministry. That is a reason which even politicians who believe in the sanctity of the bi-party system ought to reject. For the bi-party system presupposes that the two parties will play the game fairly. If one of them takes advantage of its temporary control of electoral machinery to rig the electorate in its own favour, it is guilty of conduct differing indeed in degree but not in character from that imputed to trade-union officials who, when conducting a ballot of the members, are alleged occasionally to burn hostile voting papers.

The Franchise Bill, moreover, has the further disadvantage of emphasising the injustice of which so many women reasonably complain—some of them, unfortunately, by unreasonable methods which give a plausible ground for the continuance of the injustice. The main object of the bill is to give a vote to every male person who has passed the age of twenty-one years, and who has continuously resided in the same constituency for six months. When the age of twenty-one was established by our common law as the age of majority, men ripened more rapidly than they do to-day; and important careers were in previous centuries begun and ended before the age at which so many men in the professional classes nowadays make their real start in life. For this and other reasons the most important of all the reforms which our electoral system requires is the raising of the age for voting to twenty-five at the lowest. Many hints have been thrown out by Cabinet ministers at different times that this was the intention of the Government, but the section in the Cabinet which desired this important reform has evidently been over-ruled—possibly through pressure exerted by the Labour Party. The result is, that though the bill will enfranchise a vast number of young men who are little more than boys, it will leave unenfranchised a number of educated women who have reached years of responsibility, and who complain with excusable bitterness that they are compelled to pay taxes which they have had no voice in voting, and to submit to laws which they have had no authoritative influence in framing.

If a Liberal ministry were really anxious to solve the electoral problem on principles with which Liberalism was once identified

it would insist on restoring the basic principle of the English constitution, that taxation and representation should go together, by requiring that every elector shall make some direct contribution to the expenses of the State which he helps to control. This can be done without excluding from the franchise any considerable body of individuals. What is needed is the establishment of some small universal tax, preferably a house tax, which every head of a separate household would be required to pay as a condition of registration as a voter. Under such a system the fear of the male electorate being swamped by female voters would be removed; while at the same time, by raising the age to twenty-five, most of the difficulties arising from the present lodger franchise would disappear.

If there were any idealism in English politics at the present moment, there is a further electoral reform which would be as popular in England as it is now in France—namely, the introduction of some system of proportional representation so as to secure the equitable representation in the councils of the nation not only of different geographical areas but of different phases of thought. This system has already been adopted in Belgium, and the recent elections resulted in the return of a Chamber which has been described as presenting a photograph of the opinions of the country. In France the demand for proportional representation comes from the people, and has been forced upon the politicians, many of whom are still reluctant to destroy the system of small constituencies, so advantageous to the ambitions of small men. The object of proportional representation has been admirably defined by the French Premier, M. Poincaré. It is intended, he said, 'not only to secure a fair representation of parties but to produce ' an improvement in electoral contests and in the whole tone ' of French political life.'

That there is need for improvement in the tone of English as well as French political life everyone is agreed; that proportional representation offers a fair hope of securing such improvement is denied by no one. At present the majority of electors have no real liberty in choosing their representatives. Candidates are brought forward by the party machine, and the elector, if he wishes to vote at all, must give his vote to one or other of two candidates, though he may profoundly distrust

both. Sometimes the crudity of this situation is relieved by the appearance of a third candidate, nominated by the Labour Party; but this comparatively new phenomenon in English politics produces evils of its own for which the present system provides no remedy. Where a Labour candidate appears in a field already occupied by Liberal and Conservative candidates, the result of the poll may be, and very often is, to return to Parliament a man who on a straight vote would have been rejected. To be more specific, a candidate who advocates tariff reform may be returned to Parliament by two out of five votes, the remaining three having been divided between two free-trade candidates; or, alternatively, a socialist, who advocates the nationalisation of land and railways, mines and machinery, may be returned by a minority vote—the votes of the majority being split between a Liberal and a Conservative who both believe in private property and individual enterprise.

Proportional representation is the only scheme that has yet been suggested which would prevent this injustice to the constituency as a whole, and at the same time remove the even greater injustice of denying to the individual elector any effective means of choosing his own representative. The value of the proportional system has already been recognised by the present ministry in the constitution which they conferred upon South Africa. The system has also received the adherence of a large number of private members of the House of Commons; while recently a very important deputation from Ireland headed by Sir Horace Plunkett asked that it might be introduced into the proposed new Irish constitution as a means of mitigating the tyranny of a Catholic majority which so many Protestants so gravely dread.

There is perhaps always a danger in attaching too much importance to merely mechanical changes in social institutions. At the same time, where it is notorious that ideas and ideals exist which cannot be expressed for lack of the necessary political mechanism, one may justly hope for very great advance if that mechanism is created. It may be true that the mass of the electors in England have little idea of politics beyond the crude conception of a duel between two parties, which attracts them, not on account of any particular benefit which they anticipate for the nation, but because the party conflict appeals

to their combative and sporting instincts. But there are everywhere to be found persons whose ideals of political duty are incompatible with respect for the party system, and though such persons may be in a small minority in any particular constituency, in the aggregate they make up a substantial fraction of the population of the kingdom. These electors people under present conditions have absolutely no means of giving expression to their opinions. They are as completely unrepresented in the national councils as if they had no votes at all. The injustice to them cannot be excused because the maintenance of the bi-party system happens to be convenient to party leaders and party wire-pullers.

The very creation of the Labour Party is a proof that even among the masses the old conception of politics as a fight between two parties is breaking down, and being replaced by an entirely new conception. That this new conception in some of its phases is purely selfish must be admitted, but in the main the Socialist movement, to which political expression has been given by the creation of the Labour Party, is an idealistic movement. The active and enthusiastic members of the Socialist Party are not men who have any special reason for hoping to make anything for themselves out of Socialism. Many of them are unknown, and always will remain unknown, but they are inspired with the belief that the cause which they advocate is the cause of humanity. They believe they have a new gospel for mankind, and they are willing to sacrifice themselves to preach it. That is why Socialism goes ahead, while Liberalism and Unionism stand still.

Nor is it possible under our present electoral conditions for either the Liberal or the Conservative Party to abandon the cynicism which repels so many people, or to attach to itself any of the idealism which inspires the newest party. The difficulty lies here : that the Liberals in order to carry any one of their candidates in a single-member constituency are bound to tout for the alliance of Socialists, although there is a necessary ultimate conflict between Liberal and Socialist conceptions of public policy. At the same time, the Liberals who are most opposed to the Socialist alliance, even for temporary purposes, find it impossible to join or to assist the Unionist Party because that party is pledged to a policy which all Liberals regard as injurious to the country.

This point is admirably illustrated by the recent election in the Holmfirth division of Yorkshire. The Unionist candidate, Mr. Geoffrey Ellis, in the first instance was anxious to repudiate the policy of food taxation on which Mr. Chamberlain's scheme of tariff reform is based. Pressure of a character which can easily be guessed was at once put upon him by that interesting and secret body known as the 'Confederates.' Mr. Ellis promptly climbed down, and announced his adherence to the whole of the Tory programme. His poll was a poor one, and as soon as the result was declared he wrote to the newspapers to correct some inaccurate statements made by newspaper correspondents, and ended his letter as follows:

'Over and over again during the contest Liberals who disliked Lloyd George finance came to promise me support if only I would shelve tariff reform for this election. That I refused, and stuck to my party programme in its entirety, is probably, so my Yorkshire friends and neighbours tell me, the main reason our poll had not a still greater increase.' ('Times,' June 25, 1912.)

This statement not only explains how it is that the Unionist Party fails to make any progress in the country in spite of the obvious discontent with recent Liberal legislation; it also explains the virtual abandonment by Conservatives of all appeal to Conservative ideals, and the substitution of a frank unabashed appeal to the cupidity of the poorest classes and of particular industrial interests. We do not mean for a moment to suggest that the policy of tariff reform is in itself necessarily cynical. On the contrary, in its conception it represented a magnificent and self-sacrificing ideal; while its most resolute supporters to-day are without question inspired by a single-minded desire to add to the solidarity of the empire and the prosperity of the kingdom. It is just because their belief in tariff reform is freed from all taint of self-interest that their advocacy of the cause is so effective.

Unfortunately they are debarred from putting before the electors the disinterested ideals by which they are themselves inspired. The essence of the scheme which Mr. Chamberlain launched upon a somewhat startled country in 1903 was a pecuniary sacrifice for the sake of Imperial unity. With characteristic courage he did not shrink from emphasising the part of his policy which was likely to prove most unpopular. 'If you want to give a preference to the Colonies, you must

'put a tax on food.' But when people are called upon to make a sacrifice they have a right to ask precisely for whose benefit that sacrifice is to be made. And there the Chamberlain ideal broke down. From the Colonial point of view the whole value of a British tax on foreign wheat lay in the expectation that such a tax would enable Colonial farmers to obtain a higher price for their crops than they would have obtained without the tax. Unless the preference gave them this, it gave them nothing; for already they were able to sell in the British market, at a profitable price, every bushel of wheat they raised. Therefore preference to them meant more profit. Doubtless also it meant to many of them a sentiment, and a very fine sentiment, the sentiment of imperial unity. But the Colonial farmer was to have the sentiment and the profit as well, while the English labourer, for his share of the sentiment, was expected to pay a tax of the most unpopular kind. In practice it was impossible for parliamentary candidates to go to the poorer electors of this country and tell them that their food was to be taxed in order to increase the profits of Colonial farmers. Consequently the idea of sacrifice was dropped almost as soon as it had been enunciated, and in its place was substituted an appeal to self-interest and to that anti-foreign prejudice which is instinctive in most men and in all animals. The working class electors were asked to vote for tariff reform as a means of increasing their own wages and simultaneously hitting the hated foreigner. The awkward fact of the corn tax was as far as possible obscured. Thus the whole character of the movement was changed. What began as a fine appeal to Imperial sentiment drifted into a calculation of private profit, accompanied by the glorification of primitive instincts.

Nor has the tariff reform agitation ever been able to emerge from these depths and regain the high level from which it started. Indeed, as time has gone by, the idealistic side of the agitation has shrunk more and more in spite of the honest enthusiasm of many of the leaders. Events have been very unkind to the tariff reformers. One of the strongest arguments on which Mr. Chamberlain relied in 1903 was the alleged decline in British exports to foreign countries, and throughout his campaign the suggestion was constantly made that, unless the self-governing Colonies came to our rescue, there would

be an end to British industry. Events have demonstrated the absurdity of this contention. In 1902, the year from which Mr. Chamberlain drew his statistics, British exports to the self-governing Colonies, including South Africa, were £60,000,000; they rose in 1911 to £82,000,000. Meanwhile British exports to foreign countries have risen from £174,000,000 to £295,000,000. It will be noticed that the mere increase in exports to foreign countries (£121,000,000) is greater than the whole volume of our exports to the self-governing Colonies; so that our trade, instead of being dependent on Colonial preferences, would still have been greater to-day than it was 1902, even if these Colonies had disappeared from the globe in altogether.

Events have therefore shown that, on the commercial side of the tariff reform policy, the argument upon which its author mainly relied was founded on a miscalculation. Even more important has been the influence of events upon the Imperial side of this policy. Those who have followed the development of the movement from its earliest beginnings will recollect that Mr. Chamberlain only put forward the proposal for a Colonial preference after he had repeatedly failed to persuade the Colonies to undertake their fair share of the burden of Imperial defence. Even as late as the Colonial Conference of 1902 he put defence before commerce, and if the Colonies had then responded to his eloquent invitation to join in the defence and in the government of the Empire it is hardly probable that so experienced a politician would ever have made the mistake of proposing a food tax as a bond of Imperial union. That proposal was—in no dishonourable sense—a gambler's throw. After seven years spent at the Colonial Office in constantly urging the Colonies to face their responsibilities for Imperial defence, and to open their ports to British goods with the same liberality that the Mother Country opens her ports to Colonial goods, Mr. Chamberlain, finding that the Colonies would take no step forward, proposed with splendid audacity that the Mother Country should make yet one more sacrifice to bring them to her.

And it may be that though this proposal failed, yet the very fact that it was made helped to achieve the ideal at which its author aimed. At any rate that ideal is on the way to achievement. Year by year the self-governing dominions are

drawing closer to the Mother Country, and year by year they are realising more fully that common defence is a necessity for common safety. Largely, this is due to external pressure. The Australians fear Japan; the Canadians are suspicious of the United States; all portions of the Empire realise that Germany is deliberately challenging the sea-supremacy of Great Britain. These facts alone force upon the attention of the Dominions the need for increased effort for Imperial defence. But in addition there is an undoubted growth of Imperial sentiment. The influence of this sentiment in Canada was made manifest in the elections of last year, when the Canadian people rejected a proposal for reciprocity with the United States, although it was urged by a popular minister and offered great pecuniary advantages to large sections of the population. Doubtless other considerations, not all of the highest character, helped to bring about the rejection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's scheme, but it is doubtful whether these considerations would have been adequate if the Canadians had not learnt to look upon Great Britain not only as a parent but as a partner. The direct outcome of last year's Canadian elections is the visit of the Canadian premier and a large part of his cabinet to London to consult with His Majesty's ministers as to the lines upon which Canada can best contribute to Imperial defence, and presumably also to discuss the methods to be adopted for giving her a corresponding voice in Imperial Councils.

On the spirit in which Canadian ministers approach these negotiations, fraught with such tremendous importance for the future of the Empire, an illuminating light was thrown in the speech of Mr. Foster, the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, at the Dominion Day dinner, in the Connaught Rooms, on July 1st:

'Canada cannot be satisfied with past records or with present realisation. She was cradled in safety, her infancy was protected, she has worked, not as the Israelites of old, with sword in one hand and trowel in the other, but surrounded by the security that Britain's power and might, her Army and her Navy, guaranteed to her. To these, little in the way of direct contribution has yet been made. It is impossible, I believe, that eight millions of people can long live in the consciousness of receiving great benefits and returning little in the way of gratitude therefor.' ('Times,' July 2, 1912.)

Thus the great Imperial end at which Mr. Chamberlain aimed is on the road to accomplishment without the employment of the means which nine years ago he declared to be necessary; and although he was then mistaken as to means, there can be little doubt that his eloquent advocacy of the ideal prepared the way for the progress since achieved.

In view of this triumph, it might have been thought that the English advocates of tariff reform would now be proudly proclaiming on the house-tops that their work is done; and if they were merely individuals acting independently of one another, this would certainly happen. But when men are grouped in political parties, the party programme becomes an end in itself, and the leaders of the party find it extremely difficult to effect any serious change. Thus, tariff reform remains the first plank in the Unionist platform, although the reasons for which it was originally advocated no longer apply and although no one ventures to define what the phrase means, or even to adhere to the definition given by its author.

In particular, the shuffling with regard to the food tax can only be described in blunt language as dishonest. We do not refer to the action of men like Mr. Charles Bathurst, who openly say that the food taxes ought to be dropped, but to the way in which nominal supporters of these taxes try to evade a straight definition. Take for example Mr. Freeman, the Unionist candidate for Ilkeston, who stood as a 'whole 'hogger,' and was warmly supported by extreme tariff reform papers like the 'Morning Post.' This is what he says in his final appeal to the electors:

> 'Do not believe people who tell you that I want to tax the necessaries of life. That is not true. What I and my Trade Reform friends want to do is to stop the present tariffs or taxes on food and other necessaries which we either produce ourselves *or are obliged to get from foreign countries*, and tax instead certain things foreigners send here to sell which our own workmen can make, and ought to have the wages for.' ('Morning Post,' June 29, 1912.)

Almost simultaneously we find Mr. Basil Peto, M.P., another stalwart tariff reformer, writing to the 'Pall Mall 'Gazette' to argue that a tax on foreign-grown food-stuffs, by increasing prices, would increase farmers' profits and agricultural labourers' wages, and ought therefore to be put

before the labourer ' as his *right*, not as his *handicap*.' ('Pall Mall Gazette,' June 19, 1912.)

When after nine years of agitation the authorised exponents of tariff reform differ so fundamentally, the ordinary common-sense Englishman may be excused for believing that the policy is unworkable.

But in considering the political situation we have to look at the question of tariff reform, not from the point of view of its merits or demerits, but from the point of view of the Unionist Party, which, whether willingly or reluctantly, has been committed to this policy. The moment the party which still retains as one of its titles the word ' Conservative ' adopted this policy it ceased to be a Conservative Party in any intelligible sense of the word. The modern Unionist knows that he cannot win over moderate men from the opposing camp, upon whom Conservatives should naturally count, because they are repelled by what they regard as the revolutionary policy of tariff reform. And since the Liberal moderates—for the most part manufacturers, tradesmen, young professional men, or prosperous artizans—are unavailable, the Unionist candidate must appeal to those classes of society to whom conservatism offers nothing. He must therefore drop his conservatism, and this in practice means that he has nothing left to offer to the electorate but purely material benefits. In the name of tariff reform he offers, somewhat imprudently, ' work for all ' ; and if that offer is received with scepticism by electors who are not quite so stupid as candidates appear to imagine, he offers what he calls ' Social Reform,' which means in substance doles to the poor at the expense of the rich. Having done this, he rounds off his electoral address by denouncing the cynicism of Radical politicians who promise by means of an Insurance Act to give ' 9*d*. for 4*d*.'

Even if there were any chance of this policy succeeding it still ought to be condemned, because it is corrupting the conscience of the nation. But it is doomed to failure for two reasons. The first reason is that no economic sophistries will ever remove the political handicap of Mr. Chamberlain's proposal to put a tax on the most important article of an Englishman's food. It is useless for ingenious tariff reformers to argue that what they put on bread will be taken off tea. It is still more useless, and we venture to say also more

foolish, to suggest that the price of wheat can be cheapened by limiting the sources of supply. In practice the modern Unionist candidate finds himself in this position: that when a Radical comes forward with some sensational scheme for taxing land in order that every workman may have a cheap house and a plot of ground, all that the Unionist can reply is: 'To tax the rich man's land is confiscation: what I 'propose is to tax the poor man's food.'

That is one objection to the policy, and for electoral purposes it is by itself fatal. There is another objection which has not yet been sufficiently realised but will be when the danger comes nearer. As the experience of other countries shows, there is no question which excites so keen controversy as the arrangement of a tariff, for it affects every manufacturer in his profits and every workman in the prospect of employment. Specially is this the case in a country like England, where so large a proportion of our national industry is occupied with external trade. No general tariff for this country can possibly be devised which will not injure an enormous number of industries, whatever benefit it may bring to others. The moment the tariff is laid upon the table of the House of Commons there will be a fierce agitation throughout the country which will far surpass in intensity even the irritation created by the Insurance Act. It is because conservative-minded men, to whatever party they nominally belong, are intellectually or instinctively conscious of this danger that they dread the policy of tariff reform. What the conservative man wants, and what the Conservative Party ought to offer, is rest. Instead that party offers turmoil. It may be that at this particular moment the majority of the electors are still prepared to tolerate turmoil; that the working classes, who have become class-conscious, still insist on further revolutionary legislation. But if that be so, these electors will certainly give their votes not to Conservatives but to Liberals or to Socialists. People do not go to the butcher to buy bacon, nor to the grocer to buy beef. Members of the Conservative Party have to realise that their chance of obtaining office can never arise except in periods when the country is weary of so-called 'progressive' legislation. That time may not yet be near, but it certainly will not be brought any nearer by the present Unionist policy of trying to outbid the Radicals.

It is of course true that in some previous periods Conservatives have won victories less by offering a rest from the harassment of Liberal legislation than by appealing to the patriotic sentiments of the country. But that period has passed. The Liberals, after two or three years of hesitation, have shown at least as much zeal for a supreme navy as their predecessors ; while they have gone far towards securing the adherence of the Colonies to a far-reaching policy of Imperial defence, thus realising Mr. Chamberlain's great ambition without having recourse to the measures which he declared to be necessary. It is therefore no longer possible for the Unionists to claim that they are the only patriotic and imperial party and that their opponents are Little Englanders. In this region the ground has been completely cut away from beneath the feet of the Unionist Party.

Again we do not forget that in previous periods the Conservative Party could rely upon the hereditary conservatism of large numbers of the poorer classes, and that therefore it was good policy to offer legislation which would enable these faithful followers to claim that the Conservative Party was the poor man's friend. But that period also has passed. The poorer electors who used to look to the Conservatives because they hated the Liberals now look instead to the Labour Party, and it will probably be found in most towns that the Labour Party is very largely recruited from men who were previously stalwart Tories. Nowadays the working men who look anxiously but hopelessly to the Conservative Party are not the old type of beery and boisterous workmen who voted blue because their fathers voted blue, and because they loathed the teetotal and Nonconformist Liberals, but the quiet steady men who in spite of leanings towards Radicalism or even Socialism have come to dread the tyranny of Trade Unions and the constant disturbance of Radical legislation.

The existence of such men in ever-growing numbers offers to the Conservative Party a magnificent opportunity of putting itself forward as the champion of those ancient English liberties which the Liberal Party has forgotten to defend. Such a position is essentially conservative. It might even, in view of the present tendency of politics, be described as reactionary. But we have to remember that in the history of nations as of individuals reaction, or the turning

back from a wrong road, is frequently an essential condition for real progress. It is difficult, if not impossible, to exaggerate the debt of gratitude which we English of to-day owe to those 'reactionary' Englishmen of the seventeenth century who preferred the ancient liberties established by Magna Charta to the novel tyrannies attempted by Charles I. Whether in the twentieth century any Englishman will be found with courage to lead, in the name of our ancient liberties, a revolt against the new tyranny of democratic despotism remains to be seen; but as regards the present Unionist party this is certain: that until they revert to the policy of Conservatism they may abandon the hope of attaining power.

That is not in itself a matter of very great importance, except to the individual aspirants for office. It really does not matter to the country whether a ministerial office is filled by Mr. A. B., who calls himself Liberal, or Mr. C. D., who calls himself Unionist. What does matter is the complete absence under present conditions of any political organism to give expression to that feeling of conservatism which in a greater or less degree is an inherent quality in every human being, and which is an especially marked characteristic of English people. The lack of this organism makes it impossible for the country to resist a succession of ill-devised legislative projects for interfering with the organisation of industry and the whole structure of society. That some interference with individual liberty in the conduct of industrial undertakings is from time to time necessary, and that developments of society can from time to time be aided by legislation, may be readily admitted. But it is certain that when Parliament undertakes such supremely important and tremendously difficult work as this, it should approach the problems with the utmost caution, and deal with them with the utmost deliberation. Instead, we find measures, which have been hastily knocked together by a committee of the Cabinet, or even perhaps by one Cabinet minister with the assistance of his office staff and his private friends, forced through the House of Commons without the opportunity of adequate discussion, and passed into law before the country has had time to appreciate the character of the changes proposed. It is true that under the constitution settled by the Parliament Act the House of Lords is empowered, and implicitly required, to give to the country this time for reflection, but unfortunately,

owing to the abandonment of conservatism by the Conservative Party, the House of Lords is afraid to discharge this constitutional rôle—the only rôle which forms an excuse for its continued existence. Whenever a measure can be plausibly represented as intended to confer benefit on the poorer voters, the House of Lords refuses to stay its progress lest the working-class electors, for whose votes the modern Conservative touts, should be repelled. If anything were required to prove the bankruptcy of ideas in the present Conservative Party, it is shown in the fact that after the House of Lords has failed to discharge its constitutional duty by suspending the operation of the Insurance Act, Conservative candidates up and down the country are now denouncing the Liberal Party for rushing that Act into operation.

The simple truth is that the present Unionist Party is in a hopeless position because it has abandoned its own principles. It shifts its policy day by day, almost hour by hour, to every point in the compass. Its principal journalistic adviser, who has led it from blunder to blunder, in each case with an equal profusion of dogmatic rhetoric, has now nothing to propose but that a party which is presumed to be mainly composed of English gentlemen should stop business in the House of Commons by maintaining a continuous shout of 'Dissolve, Dissolve, 'Dissolve.' Such a suggestion for the degradation of conduct is the natural outcome of the degradation of ideals.

It may be submitted that if the Unionist Party wishes to recover the position it once held in the country, it must take steps to remove the widespread impression that its guiding spirits are a group of young men whose only political principle is the attainment of office for themselves. The contrast in this connexion between the Unionist and the Socialist Parties is extremely painful to all Englishmen who believe that the true ideals of Conservatism are not less honourable, and infinitely more beneficial to the nation, than the crude conceptions of Socialism. Yet the Socialist orator, who is denounced by Unionists as an ignorant tub-thumper, sacrifices his leisure, and not infrequently part of his income, in order to preach to his fellow-men a gospel in which he believes, though he can have but little hope that the New Jerusalem which he depicts will ever be realised in his lifetime. On the other hand, the Unionist Party politician has no gospel which he can consistently

advocate because he has forgotten the principles upon which his party is based. Yet it is evident that for the true Conservative there is at present a magnificent opportunity. A large section of opinion is unmistakably weary of the incessant legislation of the last few years. Social Reform legislation, which was put forward by its authors with so much confidence as a means of solving labour problems, has only resulted in additional labour unrest. Men who welcomed that policy out of kindliness of heart in its earlier stages now see that there can be no finality in it, that it means ever-progressive transference of wealth from those who have worked and saved to those who, whether from misfortune or from fault, have no claim but their poverty to the charity of the State. Such a system of legislation, apart from the moral corruption it entails, must ultimately—though we are so rich that the date may still be long postponed—sap the sources of our wealth, and make general that poverty which is now exceptional. The logic of facts has thus prepared the ground for men who sincerely believe that the progress of human society mainly depends on individual exertions, and that the part which Parliament can play in improving the lot of the citizen is only incidental and intermittent.

EDITOR.

No. CCCCXLII will be published in October.

The Edinburgh Review

OCTOBER, 1912 No. 442

MR. BALFOUR IN THE STUDY

1. Arthur James Balfour as Philosopher and Thinker : a Collection of the More Important and Interesting Passages in his Non-Political Writings, Speeches, and Addresses, 1879–1912. Selected and arranged by WILFRID M. SHORT. Longmans, Green and Co. 1912.
2. A Defence of Philosophic Doubt. By ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, M.A., M.P. Macmillan and Co. 1879.
3. The Foundations of Belief. By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, M.P. 8th ed. Longmans, Green and Co. 1901.
4. Essays and Addresses. By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, M.P. 3rd ed. David Douglas. 1905.

FOR nearly three centuries there has been a close association between scholarship and statesmanship in England. From the time of Francis Bacon to that of Lord Morley of Blackburn there have seldom been wanting, among the conspicuous leaders of one or other of the great parties, some men who were deeply interested in learning or letters, and some who had earned distinction as writers or students. Our political history is rich in names like those of Sir William Temple, Bolingbroke, Pulteney, Carteret, Burke, Fox, Canning, Derby, Gladstone, Beaconsfield, and Salisbury, not to mention those of Swift, Addison, Grote, Macaulay and Mill, whose

All rights reserved.

owners would be remembered, or had at least the power to make themselves remembered, if they had never taken an active part in public affairs. Of our Prime Ministers during the past hundred years, one wrote brilliant satirical verse; another translated Homer; another was the author of the best political novels in the English language; another amused his leisure with classical scholarship and theological controversy; another occupied himself with serious scientific research; another has added to our libraries some charming historical and biographical studies. The fact is curious and has a significance of its own. We are supposed to be a people too closely absorbed in practical pursuits to treat letters and learning with the reverence shown to them by some other nations. Yet our higher politics has been infused more largely with a lettered and learned element than has been the case even in the country of Guizot, Lamartine, and Thiers. The reason is no doubt to be found in the peculiar character of our socio-political institutions. Our cabinets were mainly recruited from a governing class endowed with wealth and leisure, with abundant opportunities for the gratification of artistic and intellectual tastes, and with a tradition of culture which the rank and file of Parliament and of the electorate recognised and respected. An English party leader was followed not so much for his principles as his personality. The peers, the country squires, and the manufacturers liked their chief to be an English gentleman at all points, 'totus teres atque rotundus'; and though sheer force of character, even if combined with the comprehensive ignorance of a Walpole or the robust Philistinism of a Palmerston, would sometimes compel their allegiance, they understood the value of that scholarly and literary equipment of which they were themselves for the most part conspicuously deficient. It was or is one, at least, of the sources of influence wielded over miscellaneous bodies of shrewd men of the world by statesmen like Mr. Gladstone, the late Lord Salisbury, Lord Rosebery, Lord Morley, and Mr. Balfour.

The latest of our literary Premiers is certainly not the least accomplished of the line. His studies have been somewhat more serious than those of Lord Rosebery, and in reality more fruitful than those of Mr. Gladstone, though their importance has never been adequately recognised by his own generation. His views and opinions are embodied in two

philosophical works, separated from one another in their publication by a somewhat considerable interval of years, and in many scattered essays, lectures, speeches, and review articles, some of which became inaccessible to the general reader almost as soon as they appeared. A complete and uniform edition of Mr. Balfour's writings and non-political addresses, or of such of them as he wishes to be preserved, is much to be desired, if only for the assistance it would afford to the historian of the future in discussing the career and personality of the most influential figure and the most acute intelligence in the Conservative ranks during the past quarter of a century. Pending such comprehensive re-issue, the volume which heads our list has its undoubted uses. It is a collection of passages extracted from Mr. Balfour's philosophical and occasional writings and speeches by an editor who has acted for many years as his private secretary. Mr. Short explains that he alone is responsible for the selection: for Mr. Balfour preferred that it should not be submitted to him before publication. Isolated passages, detached from their context, cannot always convey an adequate idea of the author's treatment of his subject, especially when they are taken from argumentative works so close-knit in their texture as 'The Foundations of Belief' and 'A Defence of 'Philosophic Doubt.' The editor's effort to 'preserve an 'ordered sequence and continuity of thought and argument' has not been entirely successful; perhaps it could not be, though an occasional note or explanatory comment might have bridged over *lacunae* and transitions which readers unacquainted with the originals may sometimes find bewildering. But Mr. Short's anthology is fairly representative of the style and quality and, so far as is possible in such a medium, of the essential ideas of one of the most luminous and attractive intellects of our time. It may at least have aroused a curiosity in some quarters which will not be satisfied without a reference to the complete texts from which the excerpts are drawn.

Such study will be well repaid. As a thinker and a critic of life Mr. Balfour has suffered somewhat from his own versatility. It is a gift which cannot be too freely exhibited in this country without peril to its owner's reputation. We are habitually distrustful of excellence in more than one field. We do not find it easy to understand, in spite of the examples

given above, that a person who has the most insistent claims to attention in practical affairs can also be taken seriously as a man of letters ; or that a writer with a wide range of subjects and interests can handle them with competence and knowledge. Our feeling is that an author who deals with ethics, theology, or science, should be a specialist if he is to avoid the reproach of being superficial. It is a prejudice from which Mr. Balfour himself has suffered. He has touched so many things that dull people find it difficult to believe that he can be profoundly interested in anything. There was a tendency at one time to assume that the brilliant debater of the House of Commons must necessarily be a dilettante when he wrote of philosophy, science, music, or sport ; and on the other hand it was hinted that a public man who could find time to publish books on metaphysics and golf, and to lecture on aesthetics and psychical research, could not be devoting himself with the requisite earnestness to the duties of party leadership. The same criticism was sometimes levelled at Mr. Gladstone, but Mr. Gladstone countered it by an emotional solemnity of manner which is a protective apparatus that Nature has denied to Mr. Balfour. He is hardly ever solemn, and never pompous, or pretentious, or pontifical. Even when he is most in earnest, when he is speaking with the fullest depth of conviction, he does not lay aside that urbanity which lends an unfailing charm to his writings, as it has done through Parliament after Parliament to his speeches in the House of Commons. He prefers the persuasive method to the rhetorical, the ironical to the vituperative. He has the ease, the polish, the dignified, mundane temper, and the courteous restraint of the great writers and artists of the eighteenth century, with whom he has so many points of contact. We do not wonder that he finds more pleasure in this society than in that of a more recent period. His sympathetic interest in the intellectual and aesthetic development of the nineteenth century diminishes, he tells us, after the first third of that cycle was passed. ' Neither the thin lucidity of Mill, nor the ' windy prophesyings of Carlyle ; neither Comte nor yet New- ' man ' could ever arouse in him the enthusiasm of a disciple ; and he turns with pleasure ' from the Corn Law squabbles to ' the great War, from Thackeray and Dickens to Scott and ' Miss Austen, even from Tennyson and Browning to Keats,

'Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Shelley.' But the noise and arrogant vagueness of the later nineteenth century estrange him even less than the harshness and intolerance of the seventeenth. With Puritanism he has no bonds of sympathy, nor does he find its heroes and martyrs intelligible. In Cromwell he only discerns 'a somewhat ineffectual and certainly a most pathetic 'figure in our history' (p. 95). On the other hand Newton is, in his judgment, 'perhaps the greatest man the world has 'ever seen.'

This dictum is characteristic and illuminating. Mr. Balfour has an extensive range of interests and a quite remarkable power of sympathetic comprehension of many diverse phases of human activity. The headings of the extracts printed in Mr. Short's volume take us in a few pages from Bacon to Bergson, from Berkeley and the Bible to Burns, Carlyle, Cancer Research, Cambridge University, Co-partnership, Eugenics, Golf, Huxley, Sir Walter Scott, Cycling, Matrimony, National Decadence, Polar Exploration, and the Reading of Novels. Nor is this the mere fluent adaptability of the practised public speaker who has to cultivate the art of saying something at short notice about everything. No doubt Mr. Balfour, like other eminent men, finds it necessary at times over the dinner-table or on the platform to utter adroit nothings and gracefully garbed platitudes. But in Mr. Short's compilation of over five hundred pages there is hardly a paragraph which does not give the impression of some amount of reflexion based on study and independent thought and very varied reading. Even when dealing with themes which may be called trivial or commonplace Mr. Balfour usually says something that takes us below the surface. To call such a writer and speaker superficial seems singularly misplaced criticism. It is due perhaps in part to the fact that Mr. Balfour's arguments are not often well 'documented' with precise references to facts, figures, verbal quotations, statistical illustrations, and the whole apparatus of exposition and controversy; perhaps also to a certain intolerance of detail, and a reluctance to mar the artistic effect of an argument or a statement by descending to particulars. To an instructed reader it is always clear that Mr. Balfour moves lightly over difficult ground not because of the thinness of his intellectual panoply, but because he wears it with the ease

that comes of complete familiarity and accustomed use. His mastery of a subject is revealed by an acquaintance with it so intimate and matured that he has no need to display the artifices of erudition. The Essay on Handel* is a case in point. It is an admirable piece of broad, sympathetic, and penetrating criticism, which could only have been written by one who had more than an amateurish knowledge of the technique and methods of musical composition and of the works of the great tone poets. None but a very accomplished, as well as a very enthusiastic, student of music could have produced this eloquent and discriminating appreciation. It cannot be read without a sense of regret that Mr. Balfour has not found time to write more on a subject he understands so well.

But, versatile as he is, Mr. Balfour has one supreme intellectual interest, and it is that to which the key is given by the sentence, just quoted, referring to Newton. It cannot happily be said of him as it was of another eminent man, that science is his forte and omniscience his foible. Omniscience is the last attribute to which he would lay claim ; and his science, as he frequently insists, is the science of a layman, of one who has no expert knowledge derived from the lecture theatre or the laboratory. But the bent of his mind is essentially scientific. We hardly need the direct statement of his own preferences and predilections to tell us that. 'I 'would rather be known,' he has said, 'as having added some-'thing to our knowledge of truth and nature than for anything 'else I can imagine.' Of the value of scientific discovery, and the importance of scientific advance, he has shown himself more acutely conscious than any other modern statesman of the first rank. He almost suggests that the active pursuits to which he has devoted the main energies of his life are insignificant compared with the labours of the physicists, the biologists, the chemists, and the inventors ; since he holds that it is science, not politics, that dominates and directs the progress of the world in an era more fruitful of change than any of which we have record. He believes

* It appeared originally in the 'Edinburgh Review' for January 1887, and is reprinted in the 'Essays and Addresses,' p. 111 seq. An extract is given by Mr. Short.

that 'the influence of science on the business of mankind' is habitually underrated:

'If in the last hundred years the whole material setting of civilised life has altered, we owe it neither to politicians nor to political institutions. We owe it to the combined efforts of those who have advanced science and those who have applied it. If our outlook upon the Universe has suffered modifications in detail so great and so numerous that they amount collectively to a revolution, it is to men of science we owe it, not to theologians or philosophers. On these indeed new and weighty responsibilities are being cast. They have to harmonise and to co-ordinate, to prevent the new from being one-sided, to preserve the valuable essence of what is old. But science is the great instrument of social change, all the greater because its object is not change but knowledge; and its silent appropriation of this dominant function, amid the din of political and religious strife, is the most vital of all the revolutions which have marked the development of modern civilisation.'

Much as he loves literature, we may perhaps conclude that he loves science more; he would make scientific study an essential element of all the higher education, even at the expense, though not to the exclusion, of the languages of Greece and Rome;* and it is plain that the highest achievements of scientific discovery and thought set him glowing with a warmth that is only rivalled by the feeling stirred in him by some of the masterpieces of art, and quite transcends the more temperate emotion aroused by the triumphs of literature and of human action. It is difficult to recall another writer of Mr. Balfour's accomplishment who makes so little reference to the poets of his own and other countries or indulges so rarely in the luxury of a quotation from their works. Nor is it hard to understand that he finds himself irresponsive to the chords of the Sentimental Age, and that he turns with satisfaction to the times when Science, it is true, was in her infancy, but when the scientific temper, the scientific outlook upon life, dominated the minds of men.

This being so, it may seem at first sight strange enough that his most serious literary work should have been devoted to a critical and destructive examination of certain of the claims and pretensions of modern science. Mr. Balfour's place (we believe it will be a permanent and honourable place) in philosophical literature is fixed by his 'Defence of

* See the extracts under 'Education,' in Mr. Short's volume.

'Philosophic Doubt' and his 'Foundations of Belief.' Both those works are concerned in the main with an attack upon the 'Naturalism' which found its exponents among the most influential group of scientific men in the nineteenth century, and owed its origin indirectly to the speculations of the most influential group of English thinkers in the eighteenth century. Against Locke and Hume and the Deists, against Mill and Spencer and Huxley and Haeckel, are his keen and searching weapons pointed, so that some hasty readers of his books, and some others who have read only imperfect summaries of their arguments, have imagined that he endeavours to support the revelations of Religion by denying or belittling the revelations of Science. Nothing can be farther from the truth. Mr. Balfour insists that he has no quarrel with modern science. On the contrary he accepts with little reserve the conclusions which it believes itself to have established. He sits, an ardent and entranced spectator, at the pageant of evolution; he is, it would seem, a Darwinian still, even though Neo-Darwinism has gone far to undermine the stability of the original structure. He is indulgent towards the tremendous assumptions and startling hypotheses of the New Physics. It is not with science, as science, that he has any differences; but only with science when its practitioners 'pass beyond the bounds,' and profess that they have solved the riddle of the universe, and that they have drawn from their experiments and discoveries the elements of a philosophic system. 'Naturalism' Mr. Balfour regards as no less inimical to science than it is to theology, ethics, and aesthetics. He endeavours to show that an explanation of things which is not based on the mechanical operation of certain observed natural forces is required as much in the interests of the scientific investigator as in those of the priest, the moralist, the ruler, and the average man. It is a rough and inaccurate classification that enlists him hastily 'on the side of the angels' in the conflict between Religion and Science. Mr. Balfour would say that there is no conflict between Religion and Science. The opposition, in his view, is between a system of belief which, though imperfect and provisional, is consistent with both Science and Religion, and a dogmatism which carries the limited results drawn from experience and observation into regions where they have no valid jurisdiction.

He does not affect the philosophical detachment of the investigator who sets out to explore the truth without mapping out the course of his journey. He frankly confesses, what most other inquirers might admit if they were equally candid, that he is not a disinterested judge of the causes at issue. On the contrary he knows from the outset to what conclusion his analysis will lead him. His object is to show that what he calls the 'current beliefs,' by which he means the fundamental principles of Christian theology, are a more satisfactory contribution towards the solution of cosmic problems, and that they furnish a firmer basis for reasonable thought and right conduct, than any metaphysic founded on science alone. No unification of belief of any real theoretical value can be attempted on purely scientific lines—that is, by means of induction from experiences, whether these be external or internal. It is true that we are not yet—perhaps we never shall be—in a position to frame a completely coherent theory of the Universe ; our knowledge, and it may be our faculties, render it certain that any system we are able to construct must be incomplete, obscure, and in places self-contradictory. But all these defects, says Mr. Balfour, are also to be found in an explanation restricted to those natural processes and conditions of which we become cognisant by our senses and our reasoning faculty. Empirical science can tell us nothing about ultimate causes, or even about proximate causes, except in a limited and exceedingly inaccurate fashion, and it has in the end itself to rely upon assumptions which are non-rational in their character. In this respect therefore it has no advantage over the 'current beliefs'; whereas these latter avoid some of the worst difficulties of the 'naturalist' or indeed any other hypothesis, while they offer more scope for a 'provisional unification' of beliefs and feelings, and are in closer harmony with ideas and aspirations which satisfy our ethical needs. 'Any system,' says Mr. Balfour, 'which when worked out to its legitimate issues fails to effect this object can afford no permanent habitation for the spirit of man.' A scientific philosophy, which looks at nothing outside the range of natural causes and effects, can provide no such abiding-place.

But if the sphere of natural science is so constricted, how far must we travel beyond its circuit ? 'I have always,' says

Mr. Balfour, 'found it easier to satisfy myself of the insufficiency 'of naturalism than of the absolute sufficiency of any of the 'schemes by which it has been sought to modify or to complete 'it.' He passes in review the philosophy of common-sense, theism, 'rationalist orthodoxy,' transcendentalism, and the ideas of M. Bergson, and finds them all insufficient. With some of them indeed he has considerable sympathy. In an interesting examination of Bergson's philosophy he points out with legitimate satisfaction that some of the propositions of this fashionable thinker have in fact been anticipated by himself. The most powerful engine in his attack upon materialism is the demonstration of the limits of human experience and the impossibility of approaching Reality by any purely intellectual process. The intellect is a very serviceable piece of machinery; but it was manufactured by the evolutionary process primarily, as it would seem, for the purpose of enabling us to obtain that knowledge of our environment which permits us to adapt ourselves to it with success. Properly used it assists us to know a good deal about phenomena, and it is with phenomena that science is concerned. But even in regard to these its limits are soon reached. We are moved by 'values,' not by logic:

'If we examine fearlessly the grounds on which judgments about the material world are founded, we shall find that they rest on postulates about which it is equally impossible to say that we can theoretically regard them as self-evident, or practically treat them as doubtful. We can neither prove them nor give them up. Concede the same philosophic weight to values in departments of speculation which look beyond the material world, and naturalism will have to be abandoned. But the philosophy of science would not lose thereby. On the contrary, an extension of view beyond phenomena diminishes rather than increases the theoretical difficulties with which bare naturalism is beset. It is not by a mere reduction in the area of our beliefs that, in the present state of our knowledge, certainty and consistency are to be reached. Such a reduction could not be justified by philosophy. But, justifiable or not, it would be quite impracticable. Values refuse to be ignored.'

Much that M. Bergson has written on the insufficiency of the human understanding and the fallibility of human observation is to be found, in a slighter form and with less wealth of scientific illustration, in the works of Mr. Balfour. He insists

that a philosophy which in the last resort rests on the 'evidence 'of the senses' must necessarily repose on a basis of incalculable error. For the senses are imperfect instruments, developed, so modern science declares, by the action of evolution for limited and specific ends, and that only by a long series of more or less clumsy adaptations and more or less fortunate accidents. What can the sense of touch tell us of the true constitution of matter? It assures us that the material objects with which we are most familiar are inert, immobile, unorganised, solid bodies; whereas if the latest theories of the physicists are accepted they are nothing of the sort. Our main avenue to the external world is the sense of vision; but we cannot tell what it is we see and how much we do not see. The eye itself is only a modified organ of touch; and Helmholtz is reported to have said that if an optician had sent him an instrument so badly adapted for its purpose he would have returned it. Science, when Mr. Balfour was writing 'A Defence 'of Philosophic Doubt,' was of opinion that extension and mass were inseparable properties of matter, whereas colour and sound were only subjective impressions produced by vibratory impact upon the oral or visual apparatus of the observer. It is beginning to doubt whether the one set of qualities is more objective than the other. The senses cannot guide us aright. They are only useful tools: and the intellect, evolved like them to enable the organism to modify itself and survive, is little more capable than the senses, whose origin and infirmities it shares, of finding a way through the labyrinth of appearances to the underlying reality, if any reality there be. 'We are to suppose that powers which were 'evolved in primitive man and his animal progenitors, in 'order that they might kill with success and marry in security, 'are on that account fitted to explore the secrets of the universe.' Even the empirical thinker must postulate something that is derived neither from experience, observation, or reasoning, so that he falls back with Mill on 'permanent possibilities of 'sensation,' or with Spencer on the 'unknowable.' But Mr. Balfour has no mercy on either of these expedients, which cannot, he says, be deduced from strictly scientific premisses by any logical process. In the end science has to rely upon irrational foundations, and is forced to assume a creative principle which is not subject to the laws of causation

as exhibited in the material universe, and is not limited by the relations of Space and Time. Science itself, like ethics and aesthetics, needs a non-natural, or a super-natural, basis.

There are those who will say that in all this Mr. Balfour is only forcing an open door, since the uncompromising 'Naturalism' he attacks is not in reality the creed of any authoritative body of scientific men. Few, in these days at any rate, will care to assert dogmatically that a purely mechanical explanation of the universe is adequate or satisfactory, or that factors which may be called spiritual must be excluded in the name of science. But Mr. Balfour was preparing the materials for his books at a time when the current of enthusiasm set in motion by the promulgation of the evolution theory was still pouring its eddies through all the channels of the intellectual world, and when the physicists and biologists, in the first flush of their triumph, were disposed to push their conquests far into the realms occupied by the theologians and the metaphysicians. 'A Defence of Philosophic Doubt' was published in 1879, only five years after the famous Address by Tyndall at the Belfast meeting of the British Association, and eight years after the appearance of the first edition of Darwin's 'Descent of Man.' If the greater masters of the new learning hesitated to push their conclusions beyond a cautious agnosticism, it was otherwise with some of their followers; and undoubtedly there was a tendency to believe that the evolutionist thinkers had disposed not only of what Huxley called 'Hebrew tradition,' not only of the New Testament as well as of the Old, but of religion in every form, and of philosophy in any form which was not associated with materialistic rationalism.

We have witnessed within the past few years a notable reaction, of which the interest taken in the doctrines of M. Bergson is one symptom, and the revival of transcendental idealism at the English Universities another. To this reaction Mr. Balfour's own writings have contributed something. For those outside what Mr. Balfour calls 'the narrow circle of pro-'fessed philosophers,' for all indeed who have no acquaintance with the technique of metaphysics and epistemology, he has done useful service by his lucid marshalling of all the points which tell against the empirical system, and his defence of the proposition that there are an indefinite number of aspects of Nature respecting which science can give no authentic

information. Even those who will not accept the proposition will be instructed and stimulated by Mr. Balfour's discussion of it :

'We must conceive ourselves as feeling our way about this dim corner of the illimitable world like children in a darkened room, encompassed by we know not what ; a little better endowed with the machinery of sensation than the protozoan, yet poorly provided indeed as compared with a being, if such a one could be conceived, whose senses were adequate to the infinite variety of material Nature. It is true, no doubt, that we are possessed of reason and the protozoa are not. But even reason, on the naturalistic theory, occupies no elevated or permanent position in the hierarchy of phenomena. It is not the final result of a great process, the roof and crown of things. On the contrary it is no more than one of many expedients for increasing our chance of survival, and among these by no means the most important or the most enduring.'

Science, then, mighty as she is on her own ground of practice and practical classification, must recognise her limits. At the best she can only say,

> 'In Nature's infinite book of secrecy
> A little I can read.'

And if she had read, or ever could read, the whole book, there would still lie mysteries beyond into which she peers in vain.

It has been generally admitted that Mr. Balfour has been more successful as a critic of naturalistic dogmatism than in what may be called the constructive part of his work. His object is to show that the 'current beliefs' enable us to avert our gaze from the deadening spectacle of 'an irrational Universe 'which accidentally turns out a few reasoning animals at one 'corner of it, as a rich man may experiment at one end of his 'park with some curious "sport" accidentally produced among 'his flocks and herds,' a Universe in which mind is merely an instrument for securing a flexibility of adaptation such as instinct alone is not able to produce, and in which the ethical and the aesthetic manifestations are no more than 'the 'chance play of subjective sensibility or the far-off echo of 'ancestral lusts.' The hypothesis of 'a spiritual origin common 'to the knower and the known' emerges, he holds unassailably, from his consideration of the possible alternatives ; and he claims that he has shown 'how, in face of the complex 'tendencies which sway this strange age of ours, we may best

'draw together our beliefs into a comprehensive unity which 'shall possess at least a relative and provisional stability.' That unity is found in the 'current beliefs' based on Christian theology, with the acceptance of the Divine Incarnation and the miracles recorded in the Gospels.

Ingenious and acute as are the arguments by which this conclusion is reached, Mr. Balfour acknowledges that they may fail to give satisfaction either to the 'ordinary believer or 'the ordinary unbeliever.' Nor is it hard to understand why this should be the case. The 'believer' may be justified in inquiring what 'current beliefs' are really established by a conception of Christian theology standing apart from that of any of the Churches to which he is likely to owe allegiance. One can conceive that to the orthodox member of any organised religious community this scientific and reasoned version of his faith may be open to some of the objections Mr. Balfour urges against Theism, and against the 'Natural 'Religion' which accepts the Christian ethics, but denies the Christian revelation. If it is successful in avoiding some of the difficulties which a strictly dogmatic religious creed involves, it only does so by creating others. In his search for that unifying principle so insistently demanded by modern philosophy and modern science, Mr. Balfour ignores the dualism that is an essential element of all the Christian creeds. He clings firmly to the hope of immortality, but it is an immortality of reward and compensation; the idea of failure is excluded. The philosophical Christian apologist may need a Heaven, but cannot admit the intolerable idea of Hell. A Spirit of Evil, working alongside the Divine Spirit of Good, through Time if not through Eternity, is ruled out as revolting or grotesque. But the 'current beliefs' of a Christianity founded upon the New Testament have not divested themselves of these elements. In their implication, Life, the Creation, the Universe, must be figured as the scene of a perennial conflict, in which the legions of darkness are arrayed against the forces of light; Evil is a reality as well as Good; and the freedom which is the inalienable attribute of the soul is freedom to do wrong as well as freedom to do right. The fourth chapter of St. Luke cannot be dismissed, as Mr. Balfour dismisses the cosmogony of Genesis, in a footnote, not at least by those who believe, as apparently Mr. Balfour himself does, in the inspiration of the New Testament, and are

willing, as he is, to accept the miracles of Christ on the authority of the Synoptic Gospels. The dualism which has been preached by the authoritative exponents of Christianity from St. Paul downwards may be disagreeable to the cultured modern exponent of a scheme of things at once spiritual and reasonable. But there it is, fast wedged in the 'current beliefs,' and the current believer has some right to complain of what has been irreverently called Christianity *à la carte*: as though you might treat the constituent doctrines like the items on a restaurant menu, and select only the dishes which happen to agree with your taste and your mental digestion. It may be added that the proceeding if it clears away some difficulties only raises others. Mr. Balfour's treatment of the problem of sin and pain cannot be deemed entirely successful. By rejecting Christian dualism he is driven back upon the conception of an omnipotent and benevolent Creator, Who in His wisdom has chosen to create evil as well as good, but is yet inclined to give 'preferential treatment' to the latter. There are some who will think that even Kant's unconditioned Absolute, un-moral, indifferent, inactive, an unconcerned spectator of the world of its own emanation, is more satisfactory than this strange embodiment of the Divine Reason.

May it not also be suggested that dualism—conflict—the clash of opposing energies and tendencies, is the only condition of existence as we know it? Mr. Balfour objects to M. Bergson's theories that they have no teleological significance: they promise nothing but life, and yet more life. 'In his 'philosophy super-consciousness is so indeterminate that it is 'not permitted to hamper itself with any purpose more definite 'than self-augmentation.' Why, asks Mr. Balfour, does not M. Bergson invoke God with a purpose rather than super-consciousness with none? Perhaps the French philosopher feels that the difficulty attending any teleological system has been accentuated by modern science and modern tendencies of thought, even, it may be said, by the characteristics of the modern temperament. What is the purpose presumed to underlie the perpetual conflict which Bergson envisages as that between the *élan vital* and the obstructions of matter, which orthodox Christianity supposes to be between Good and Evil, which science surveys in the evolutionary process? The end must be perfection, and the final cessation of the struggle a condition of motionless equilibrium. Such

a condition is inconceivable. There is no existence without movement. Equilibrium can be produced, so far as we know in nature, not by the extinction of antagonistic forces, but by their interaction or opposition. If we turn to that small fragment of the Universe with which we are best acquainted, humanity and human society, it seems to the active modern spirit that Perfection, if it were possible, would be unendurable. A community in which there was no antagonism of mental and physical forces, and no evil to overcome, would be intolerably stupid. Genius, talent, virtue, all the higher developments of the intellect and character, are the results of conflict with adverse conditions. In a perfect society the genius which expresses itself in courage would not be wanted, for there would be no dangers to overcome; the genius of the political reformer would disappear, for there would be nothing to reform; so would that of the moralist, for everybody would be moral. The artist might remain as a decorator; but great art—drama, music, poetry, painting—is concerned in the main with the conflict of motives, duties, aspirations, and individuals. The scientist would not be needed to carry on the warfare with nature if nature too is to be made perfect, and complete harmony between organism and environment secured.

This is indeed another side of the difficulty which in our age blurs the vision of immortality. For when we abandon the anthropological idea of a resurrection of the mind, if not of the body, we have nothing but spiritual perfection, cessation, eternal quiescence, union with the Absolute Soul, *Nirvana*. The attraction of that prospect is its promise of escape from a world of strife and suffering, and the less there is of strife and suffering, the slighter will be the allurements offered by the promise of infinite and eternal repose.

Mr. Balfour, however, is not engaged in the presentation of any form of orthodox Christianity. His object is to vindicate the general scheme of Christian thought as a mode of spiritual belief against those who contend that any such belief is unreasonable or unscientific. He examines the contention that scientific beliefs have a special claim to confidence on the ground that, unlike those which prevail in the ethical and theological spheres, they are based either on reason or experience. He maintains that, on the

contrary, the great majority of all our beliefs, scientific and other, must be called irrational; that is, they are not, in the main, conclusions arrived at by any ratiocinative process, nor are they obtained by the direct evidence of our senses. What we perceive, what we think, and what we know or suppose we know, are the results of uncertain activities and the product of imperfect instruments. It is true the judgments that deal with material things, and particularly with material things with which we are in constant and necessary contact, including many of the phenomena most familiar to science, have what Mr. Balfour calls a peculiar character of 'inevitableness'; since everybody has and must have certain fixed convictions about the world in which he lives, certain beliefs that guide us in the ordinary conduct of existence, and supply us with the fundamental assumptions or pre-suppositions on which the scientific fabric is built.

These elemental beliefs have been bitten into the consciousness of mankind from the earliest period of its history, and are therefore held with the tenacity of the lessons we learnt in the nursery. But that does not really mean that these judgments of perception, 'inevitable' though they be, approximate more closely to the truth than those of the other class, or that the beliefs of science rest on a different plane of certitude from those of ethics and religion. What it really signifies, according to Mr. Balfour, is that our beliefs are the result of various processes with which reason has little connexion. They are usually derived from authority, habit, intuition or necessity. We form or inherit them first, and seek to justify them afterwards. In his chapters on Authority and Reason Mr. Balfour dwells with much force on the entirely 'irrational' character of precisely those convictions which are held with the most unquestioning faith. All men believe that it is wrong to commit murder, without pausing to consider why; though probably no two persons would give precisely the same reason for their opinion, and some would be unable to give any reason at all that would logically justify the taking of life on the battle-field or the scaffold and condemn it when the agency is that of the assassin's knife. Yet they know (that is they feel) where the distinction lies, and that is enough. Indeed it is more than enough. It is by the habitual opinions rooted in us by tradition, authority,

education, and sentiment that individuals and societies live and conduct their affairs. If they did not, if they took the opposite course of testing every judgment and every act by its conformity with what are supposed to be the dictates of right reason, their condition would be intolerable :

'Suppose for a moment a community of which each member should deliberately set himself to the task of throwing off as far as possible all prejudices due to education ; where each should consider it his duty critically to examine the grounds whereon rest every positive enactment and every moral precept which he has been accustomed to obey ; to dissect all the great loyalties which make social life possible, and all the minor conventions which help to make it easy ; and to weigh out with scrupulous precision the exact degree of assent which in each particular case the results of this process might seem to justify. To say that such a community, if it acted upon the opinions thus arrived at, would stand but a poor chance in the struggle for existence is to say far too little. It could never even begin to be ; and if by a miracle it was created, it would without doubt immediately resolve itself into its constituent elements.'

It is not reason which would cause most of us to refuse even to discuss the possible grounds for believing in witchcraft, a belief which has died a natural death, without any controversy worth mentioning, simply because the mental atmosphere of a rationalistic age is absolutely fatal to its chance of survival. The 'psychological climate' it is which nurtures an opinion to vigorous life or chills it into extinction. Mr. Balfour draws an illustration from English history in the seventeenth century. It was the reaction against Puritanism and the military and bureaucratic rigour of the Cromwellian period which filled the larger part of the nation with an exaggerated fervour of loyalty for the restored Stuart monarchy ; and it was only after this temper had prevailed in the practical sphere and had become dominant that it was considered necessary for Hobbes to account for it by the perverted philosophy of the 'Leviathan' or for Anglican divines to vindicate it by the preposterous doctrine of Divine Right.

Our latest scientific teachers are in no better situation than their predecessors to repudiate the influence of authority over currently held opinions and beliefs. Explanations of natural processes and phenomena, in which implicit

confidence is reposed by large numbers of educated persons, are taken on trust. Most of us would be quite incapable of testing these statements for ourselves, or even of understanding the mathematical and physical researches on which they are based; but we are told that these calculations and demonstrations have satisfied men on whose competence and ability we rely, and so we are content to suppose that the results, incredible or fantastic as they may seem in the light of our ordinary experience, are well established. The prevalent conception of the ether is really harder to justify by any reasoning process accessible to most of us than that of an anthropomorphic god or of a whole pantheon of deities with the shapes, the organs, and the passions of men. That the Universe was designed as the Forth Bridge was designed; that it was created, and is controlled, by an intelligence like unto our own though of infinitely greater scope; that this intelligence may be clothed in a magnified and perfected form of the human body: all this may seem absurd, undignified, or immoral, but it is not inconceivable. But what are we to say when we are asked to credit the existence of a substance which is more rarefied than the lightest gas known and yet has a density hundreds or thousands of times greater than the heaviest metal: which is without structure and without motion, and so is absolutely unlike any other object of which we have cognisance in nature: which can pull the tides towards the moon with the strength of a bar of steel four hundred miles thick, and yet can allow suns and planets and waves of light to pass through it without resistance or friction: which has the self-contradictory quality of being at once entirely elastic and completely rigid? Yet in this strange hypothesis, which baffles not only our experience but our imagination, we are not unwilling to believe: because men of the highest authority assure us that such a belief is necessary to explain the operation of the various forms of energy and to lend coherency to our conceptions of the constitution of matter.

Science, in fact, believes in the ether because Science cannot do without it. We believe in any proposition, whether it is the result of authority, 'psychological climate,' inherited instinct, or tradition, when we find it satisfies our needs. The judgments of perception concerning material things and

natural phenomena have satisfied the needs of the human organism considered as a product of psychological and social evolution. But why, asks Mr. Balfour, does not the same principle apply to those spiritual beliefs and conceptions which answer to the higher needs of the race? *Credo quia credo* might be the answer to those who ask why any faith should be accepted even though it cannot justify itself by an appeal to the experience which Mr. Balfour rejects, or the special Revelation which he passes on one side. The mere existence of a belief gives it a sanction; provided that its vitality has been shown by its permanence and wide diffusion, that it is valuable in itself, and that it supplies a basis not merely for the religious emotions, but for philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, and even scientific knowledge. Mr. Balfour urges that we must believe in the Divine Reason and the Divine Purpose because without them we have no escape from an entirely irrational, and therefore an entirely meaningless, Universe.

It has been said of Mr. Balfour's argument that it seems better calculated to lead to the Theism or 'Rational Religion' which he repudiates than to the Christian theology which he desires to support. The agnostic, the positivist, the various persons whom he groups under his 'Naturalist' label, may no doubt admit the strength of his indictment of a merely mechanical explanation of the Universe. 'What scientific 'beliefs,' he asks, 'do we contradict if we assert that a Super-'natural Power has on various occasions interfered with the 'operation of natural laws?' None at all, we imagine any reasonable scientist might reply. The question, it is true, does not seem otiose when we find a distinguished biologist in an Address to the British Association in the year 1912 discussing the origin of life with the proviso that we must set aside 'as devoid of scientific foundation the idea of immediate 'supernatural intervention.'* What Professor Schäfer perhaps meant—at any rate, what he should have meant—is that science, while it is quite incapable of denying the supernatural, is concerned only with natural processes. For these it must look, and it must presume that in any particular case its search will be successful until it has evidence to the contrary. Scientific progress would be impossible on any other assumption;

* Presidential Address of Professor Schäfer at the meeting of the British Association at Dundee, 4th September, 1912.

and the business of the scientist is to find a natural explanation whenever he can, instead of abandoning the task, and falling back upon supernatural intervention as an excuse for imperfect knowledge, or a substitute for closer investigation.

But science has no reason in the world to deny the existence of the Supernatural ; and even if it prefers to use the term Unknowable it would be guilty of highly unscientific conduct if it presumed to prescribe limits to the operations of a Power of which it knows nothing. It is one of Mr. Balfour's strongest points that the admission of the Supernatural as a possibly disturbing element in the ' uniformity of nature ' is no treason against natural laws ; for properly speaking these laws express nothing but the expectation that certain results which have, within our own limited sphere of observation, usually followed certain antecedent happenings will continue to do so. We expect the sun to rise in the morning and we expect the postman to deliver our letters ; and though it is in the highest degree probable that the one event will occur, and quite likely that the other may not, we are not entitled to predicate absolute certainty in either case. Our belief, valid enough for all practical purposes in the certitude of natural laws, is entirely consistent with the idea of extra-natural interference with the operation of causes and effects as we understand them.

But the ' unbeliever ' may be disposed to agree with Mr. Balfour in his demonstration of the inadequacy of the materialistic systems without accepting his alternative. It may be noted that, though Mr. Balfour himself accepts the miracles of the Gospel narrative and declines to be daunted by the ' Higher Criticism,' he does not buttress himself on the New Testament for its evidential value. The difficulties of the naturalist sceptic on these points are formulated with much force and candour :

' Explain to him that there is good historic evidence of the usual sort for believing that for one brief interval during the history of the Universe, and in one small corner of this planet, the continuous chain of universal causation has been broken ; that in an insignificant country inhabited by an unimportant branch of the Semitic peoples events are alleged to have taken place which, if they really occurred, at once turn into foolishness the whole theory in the light of which he has been accustomed to interpret human experience, and convey to us knowledge which no mere contemplation of the general order of Nature could enable us even dimly to anticipate.

What would be his reply? . . . Granting all that was asked, and more, perhaps, than ought to be conceded; granting that the evidence for these wonders was far stronger than any that could be produced in favour of the apocryphal miracles which crowd the annals of every people; granted even that the evidence seemed far more than sufficient to establish any incident, however strange, which does not run counter to the recognised course of Nature: what then? We were face to face with a difficulty, no doubt; but the interpretation of the past was necessarily full of difficulties. Conflicts of testimony with antecedent probability, conflicts of different testimonies with each other, were the familiar perplexities of the historic inquirer. In thousands of cases no absolutely satisfactory solution could be arrived at . . . But at least it might be said with confidence that no explanation could be less satisfactory than one which required us, on the strength of three or four ancient documents—at the best written by eye-witnesses of little education and no scientific knowledge, at the worst spurious and of no authority—to remodel and revolutionise every principle which governs us with an unquestioned jurisdiction in our judgements on the Universe at large.'

The critic disposed to use the formidable weapon here placed ready to his hand may not find its edge blunted by the arguments subsequently presented to him. If he considers, as Mr. Balfour supposes he will, that the historic evidence in favour of the Incarnation and the Miracles is inconclusive, he may remain unconvinced even when he is shown that by accepting it he obtains a good basis for a 'provisional' system of beliefs which enables him to emerge from the perplexities and contradictions of rationalist thought. But the apologetic side of Mr. Balfour's speculations is thin and unsubstantial compared with the critical portion. It lacks the finish which he bestows on the analysis of logical methods, the limits and scope of reasoning, and the character of the empirical system. Here, in spite of the deliberate unobtrusiveness of its form, his work has been of genuine importance, and it must be reckoned with by those who take account of the intellectual movement in England during the past few decades. It would be absurd to repeat the hackneyed aphorism that Mr. Balfour has given up to party what was meant for mankind. But it is permissible to suggest that if the superior attractions of a great public career had not exerted their claim upon Mr. Balfour's energies he might well have found his place among those whose metaphysical speculations have exercised a permanent influence upon the best thought of the world.

SIDNEY LOW.

SECRET REMEDIES

1. **Secret Remedies.** What they Cost and What they Contain. London. British Medical Association. 1909.

2. **More Secret Remedies.** What they Cost and What they Contain. London. British Medical Association. 1912.

3. Articles by Dr. F. ZERNIK in the *Deutsche Medicinische Wochenschrift.* Berlin.

4. **Government Blue Book on 'The Practice of Medicine and 'Surgery by Unqualified Persons in the United Kingdom.'** [Cd. 5422.] Wyman and Sons.

5. **The Agitation against Patent and Proprietary Medicines and Foods.** Published by the 'Owners of Proprietary Articles 'Section' of the London Chamber of Commerce. London. 1912.

6. **A Sequel to Secret Remedies (in Search of Truth).** By FREDERICK PHILLIPS. London. Evan Macleod, 30 Holborn. 1912.

7. **British Medical Journal.** Reports of the Proceedings of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed by the Treasury to inquire into the question of patent and proprietary medicines, etc. 1912.

8. **Das Geschlechtsleben in England, mit besonderer Beziehung auf London.** Von Dr. EUGEN DÜHRER. Charlottenburg and Berlin. 1901–3.

9. **Quackery and Medical Law Reform.** By HENRY SEWILL. P. S. King and Son. 1912.

10. **Truth Cautionary Lists.**

11. The advertisement sheets of low-class periodicals in England, France, and Germany.

IT is often lamented that the news columns of our daily papers are drowned amidst a swarm of advertisements of every kind: and the wish is sometimes expressed that a newspaper might be instituted which should be confined solely to the news of the day. But there are certainly a large number of newspaper readers who do not in the least share this wish. They find—as does the present writer—that the advertisements are often more interesting than the news; and so far from desiring the news without the advertisements, they in

many cases prefer to spend their money on the purchase of papers which devote themselves mainly to advertisements and neglect the news. For of what does the news in an average ½*d.* paper mainly consist? Of football matches and horse-racing, entertaining enough doubtless for those who like them; of the prices of stocks and shares, which appeal only to a limited class; of the speeches of politicians, which, however important they may be for the continued existence of the universe, do not tend to produce any uncontrollable desire to peruse them.

The advertisements, on the other hand, are commonly full of human interest and instruction. The first impression perhaps that one gathers from them is that the world is divided into the two classes of impostors and idiots, of knaves and fools. For example, in a well-known magazine is to be found more than one advertisement of astrologers, who offer, for a small fee, to forecast the future by the help of the stars. And these advertisements are not mere feelers put out by rascals to ascertain the existence of a market. Month after month the same advertisements appear, showing that regular business is done. The advertisements moreover are occasionally accompanied by a photograph of the astrological professor who offers his services: a photograph which to a novice in these matters appears calculated to dissipate promptly and for ever the professor's clientèle; but which, if we may judge from its recurrence, does nothing of the kind. Hence may be drawn two interesting conclusions: that the gross imposture of astrology still finds advocates in the twentieth century; and that the photograph of a rascally face incites certain persons to forward their money to the presumptive owner.

On looking through these advertisements one cannot fail to be struck by the large space taken up by proprietary medicines. In the pages of a single magazine one may find advertised guaranteed cures for almost every disease that human nature is heir to. No matter from what complaint the reader may be suffering, he will find promises of relief and permanent cure; and he will be astonished to observe that some of the drugs offered are so efficacious in character that they will cure not one disease only, but practically any disease whatsoever. One is 'a guaranteed cure for all blood diseases; it never 'fails to cure scrofula, cancerous ulcers, syphilis, gout, dropsy,

'etc.' Another announces 'Whatever you may be suffering 'from, don't worry; ———'s preparations are certain to cure 'you.' A third cures 'bowel complaints with one dose, 'typhus with two doses, diphtheria with three, scarlet fever with four, cholera with five, and influenza with six.' * It requires in short no great penetration to perceive that a large amount of fraud is practised in the trade of proprietary medicines; and this inference is borne out by the frequency with which 'proprietors' figure in the 'Truth Cautionary List.' But it is easy to overdo the charge. In what trade is there not fraud? In many very respectable trades it is said that a man cannot hold his own against competition if he deals with absolute fairness.† When we buy a loaf and find it to be short weight, we do not accuse the whole baking trade of fraud. Nor because some proprietary medicines make fraudulent claims must we assume that the whole trade is bad. It is our purpose here to investigate the extent of the evil, and to consider what legislative or administrative action may be employed to deal with it.

The attack was opened by the 'British Medical Journal' in 1904 with a series of articles, republished by the British Medical Association in 1909 under the title of 'Secret Remedies.' In that work were published the results of a large number of analyses of secret remedies, mostly made, it is understood, by Mr. E. F. Harrison, an analyst of distinction. Advertisements were collected from periodical literature, the nostrums advertised were written for, and when received were analysed. The very great success of this work, of which about 150,000 copies have been sold, induced the Association to publish another similar volume during last summer entitled 'More 'Secret Remedies.' The following examples of the results published in these two works are taken at random.

Perhaps the most famous of all proprietary medicines is Beecham's Pills. Of these it is stated 'A box of these 'pills, advertised to be worth a guinea, is sold for 1*s.* 1½*d.*, and 'the prime cost of the ingredients of the fifty-six pills it contains 'is about half a farthing.' Analysis disclosed that they consist

* This particular remedy was analysed and found to consist of dilute nitric acid, flavoured with peppermint.

† See Essay by Herbert Spencer on 'The Morals of Trade,' Essays, vol. iii.

of aloes, ginger, and soap. 'No other medicinal ingredient 'was found.' Beecham's Pills are advertised to cure:

'Constipation, headache, dizziness or swimming in the head, wind, pain, and spasms at the stomach, pains in the back, restlessness, insomnia, indigestion, want of appetite, fullness after meals, vomitings, sickness of the stomach, bilious or liver complaints, sick headaches, cold chills, flushings of heat, lowness of spirits, and all nervous affections, scurvy and scorbutic affections, pimples and blotches on the skin, bad legs, ulcers, wounds, maladies of indiscretion, kidney and urinary disorders, and menstrual derangements.'

Apparently in reply the proprietors have advertised that 'Beecham's Pills cannot be analysed, and all published analyses 'are hereby pronounced erroneous and misleading.' They also affirmed that there are in their remedy half-a-dozen substances not named in the analysis. Mr. Harrison, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee, stated that there might be substances which modify the action of the aloes and the soap while eluding analysis.

Another interesting nostrum is Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People. This is advertised to cure a great variety of diseases. On analysis the pills were found to be merely a variety of the ordinary Blaud's pill, which is commonly used as an iron tonic. It is stated, however, that they are of lower strength than usually prescribed, and 'very carelessly prepared.' The ordinary retail price of Blaud's pills is a few pence a gross: whereas the Pink Pills for Pale People are sold at 2*s.* 9*d.* per box of thirty: the actual cost of the ingredients of such a box being estimated to be one-tenth of a penny.

A still more glaring contrast between the price of a nostrum and the value of the ingredients, disclosed in it by analysis, is furnished by the case of Tuberculozyne, an American preparation which sells largely in Great Britain, and is advertised as a cure for consumption. The fee demanded for a month's treatment is £2 10*s.*: for this sum the patient receives two bottles which, according to the analysis, 'consist of little more 'than coloured, flavoured water': the estimated cost of their joint ingredients being 2½*d.**

* Subsequently the maker stated that he relied on copper for the efficiency of this preparation. It then transpired that the preparation was imported into this country in iron drums, which would result, as every schoolboy knows, in a deposit of the copper and the

Dr. Hartmann's Antineurasthin is another preparation which has been widely advertised both in Germany and England as a brain and nerve food. The advertisement of this nostrum contains passages of the following character :

' On the highest possible authority it is heralded that science has proved equal to the stern necessity which demanded the discovery of Antineurasthin, the brain and nerve food . . . No longer need the brain worker struggle on under the cloud of fear of failing powers of brain and body. He or she may, by including Antineurasthin as an article vitally necessary in the daily dietary, build up and maintain that perfect balance of mental and physical power which alone can uphold health and happiness.'

Antineurasthin has been analysed both in Germany (by Dr. Zernik) and in England : the result, published in ' More ' Secret Remedies,' is ' that the daily dose of this preparation, ' costing 9*d*., represents about a teaspoonful of beaten-up egg ' and a wineglassful of skim milk.'

The Antineurasthin company figures also in the ' Truth ' Cautionary List ' for 1910, where it is stated that this nostrum has ' been the subject of a public warning from the chief of the ' Berlin police.' The proprietors have made much use of an ' analysis ' by an individual whose name is also to be found in Truth's list as an ' analyst who supplies puffs for quack ' remedies,' and who, when not so engaged, ' occupies himself ' running theatrical tours in the provinces.'

The ignorance of advertisers is often very apparent. Thus Mer-Syren, Ltd., state in their advertisements that ' as regards ' the nature of disease, the medical profession is pretty much ' where Harvey left it nearly three centuries ago.' Further, that a part of the ' Materia Medica ' now ' almost universally ' used by medical men ' consists of ' . . . beetles, spider's web, ' crab's eyes, tiger's tongue, rhinoceros horn.' The advertisement of this nostrum continues :

' The discovery of Mer-Syren ushered in a new era in the history of medicine ; not only so far as the liver was concerned, but also in the case of many other affections regarding the treatment of which medical men of every school confessed themselves to be nonplussed.

---

taking up of iron into solution ; so that by the time the preparation was placed upon the English market scarcely a trace of copper remained in it. (Mr. E. F. Harrison before the Parliamentary Committee, July 4, 1912).

. . . Under its specific and benign—yet effective—operation the powers of nature have been reinforced and strengthened so that she has been enabled to quickly relieve herself from the incubus of disease, and, phœnix-like, arise from her ashes, renewed, invigorated, and endowed with all her pristine vitality.

'This is the sober opinion gleaned from an experience of one versed in medicine for a period of nearly forty years . . .

'Although its gentle, stimulating and strengthening powers are felt throughout the entire organism, yet its specific healing actions are principally directed to any part labouring under diseased or disordered action. By virtue of its unique and specific properties Mer-Syren immediately operates upon any organ or tissue whose functions may be in any way deranged, or whose structure may be breaking down in consequence of disease.'

In the newspaper advertisement Mer-Syren is described as a 'powder derived from a herb.' Analysis pointed to the conclusion that the herb in question was no other than potato: and that this nostrum, advertising itself as 'one of the greatest 'boons ever conferred upon suffering humanity' is in fact simply powdered potato.

In many advertisements the attempt of an ignorant man to use scientific phraseology is often ludicrous; as where an advertiser describes his preparation as 'very potential,' or affirms that the white corpuscles of the blood are yeast cells, or that acetic acid is an absolute poison, or that where his ointment is applied there is no foothold for microbes—presumably because the feet of the microbes are not adapted to the greasy surface which it presents.

Such advertisements, moreover, are often accompanied by photographs of the proprietor, or of patients alleged to have been cured by the nostrum advertised. Sometimes proprietor and patient are one person, as, for instance, in an illustrated advertisement of a cure for piles, in which the proprietor states that after years of martyrdom to this disease he discovered a drug with which he cured himself and which he now offers to the public. But the attached photograph of his face is not in the least convincing.

A singularly evil branch of the trade in proprietary medicines is that concerned with sexual matters, on which the prevailing ignorance furnishes, as always, a rich breeding-ground for superstitions. The 'Geschlechtsleben in England' of Eugen Dühren, now better known as Dr. Iwan Bloch, contains some very curious information on advertisements of this kind: and although belonging to the class 'librorum

'prohibitorum' should be read by those who desire wider knowledge. 'Female Pills' are especially obnoxious. The only remedy of this class that need be mentioned is one that was found to contain, amongst a number of other substances, a small quantity of a powdered beetle, probably due to one of the ingredients having been beetle-infested!

As an instance of the claims put forward by certain proprietors of cure-alls, the following quotation may be made from one advertisement of a single remedy to cure the following diseases:

'Dropsy. Insanity. Tubercular diseases. Consumption. Bronchitis. Asthma. Heart, stomach and liver diseases. Inflammatory and painful diseases of the spleen, pancreas, womb, kidneys, bladder and bowels. Mumps. Abscesses. Scrofula . . . Hydrocephalus . . . Measles . . . Smallpox. Fevers of all kinds . . . Organic debility. Angina pectoris . . . Diphtheria . . . Whooping cough . . . Bleeding of the nose, eyes, or ears . . . Polypus of the nose, etc. . . . Vermin under the skin . . . Poisoning by bad or putrid fish . . . Erysipelas . . . Boils . . . Piles. Hysteria. Tooth-, jaw-, and face-ache. Sciatica. Neuralgia. Lumbago . . . Pleurisy . . . Epilepsy . . . Painful, prolonged, and difficult parturition . . . Difficult, deficient, painful, or suppressed menstruation . . . Leucorrhea . . . Squinting. Sunstroke . . . Sore throat. Cold in the head . . . Bright's disease. Diabetes . . . Cataract. Amaurosis. Short-sightedness . . .'

We are irresistibly reminded of Molière's 'Malade Imaginaire,' where the 'Bachelierus' is examined for his medical degree by several doctors:

Secundus Doctor

'Domandabo tibi, docte Bacheliere,
Quae sunt remedia
Quae in maladia
Ditte hydropisia
Convenit facere.

Bachelierus

'Clysterium donare,
Postea seignare,
Ensuitta purgare.*

---

* Give an injection,
Then bleed him,
Afterwards purge him.

Chorus

'Bene, bene, bene, bene respondere.
Dignus, dignus est intrare
In nostro docto corpore.

Tertius Doctor

'Domandabo tibi, docte Bacheliere,
Quae remedia eticis,
Pulmonicis, atque asmaticis,
Trovas à propos facere.

Bachelierus

'Clysterium donare,
Postea seignare,
Ensuitta purgare.

Chorus

'Bene, bene, bene, bene respondere.
Dignus, dignus est intrare
In nostro docto corpore.

Quartus Doctor

'Super illas maladias
Doctus Bachelierus dixit maravillas;
Mais . . .
Faciam illi unam quaestionem.
Dès hiero maladus unus
Tombavit in meas manus:
Habet grandam fievram cum redoublamentis,
Grandam dolorem capitis,
Et grandum malum au costé,
Cum granda difficultate
Et pena de respirare:
Veillas mihi dire,
Docte Bacheliere,
Quid illi facere?

Bachelierus

'Clysterium donare,
Postea seignare,
Ensuitta purgare.

Quintus Doctor

'Mais si maladia
Opiniatria
Non vult se garire,
Quid illi facere?

Bachelierus

'Clysterium donare,
Postea seignare,
Ensuitta purgare;
Reseignare, repurgare, et reclysterisare.

Chorus

'Bene, bene, bene, bene respondere.
Dignus, dignus est intrare
In nostro docto corpore.'

A sufficient number of examples have been cited to indicate the character of the case brought against proprietary medicines. We must admit that it is a strong case. Moreover, all the methods of the trade appear to be tainted with the same vulgar claptrap that we find in their advertisements. If an enquiry about the price of a medicine does not result in a purchase, a succession of letters and circulars is forwarded at intervals to the enquirer, offering to reduce the price for him as a special favour, and holding out all sorts of inducements, couched, it need hardly be said, in the language of the most degraded of touts.

Having now stated the case for the doctors, we must give an account of the reply which has been made to them. At the outset, it is pointed out that the attack on proprietary medicines has been levelled not by the victims of their fraud, nor by philanthropists or social reformers, but by the British Medical Association, representing the medical profession; and it has been suggested that the Association is animated chiefly by the desire to suppress unlicensed competition. Attention is drawn to the fact that the 'British Medical Journal' itself makes a very large income (stated however to be less than 20,000*l.* a year) from advertisements in its pages of proprietary medicines: and that these advertisements do undoubtedly often make claims that are quite unwarrantable, as in one case of a 'sovereign remedy in all cases of constitutional disorders, 'gall stones, kidney, gravel, diabetes, liver complaints, and all 'gouty ailments'; and in another case of 'a remedy for all

'irritating skin diseases.' That advertisements in the 'British 'Medical Journal' are not usually so exaggerated as those in the lay Press may be accounted for by the greater knowledge, and therefore greater scepticism, of those to whom they are addressed. The attitude of the English profession in attacking the whole system of proprietary medicines while publishing extensive advertisements of such medicines in their own journal has been severely criticised by the 'Journal of the American 'Medical Association.'

In further defence of the proprietors of secret remedies, it is pointed out that doctors themselves often prescribe proprietary medicines to their patients; and that Dr. Cox, Medical Secretary to the British Medical Association, himself admitted in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee (25th of June) that there were some proprietary medicines which he personally preferred to any formula in the 'Pharmacopœia.' While on the other hand Dr. Cox, questioned by the Committee (18th of June), said he did not think it would be possible to produce actual cases in which people had suffered injury from the sale of proprietary medicines.

In view of these facts, doubts have been expressed about the philanthropic motives of the Association. Very large sums of money are spent by the public in the purchase of proprietary medicines, and it may be surmised that if the sale of such medicines were suppressed, much of this money would be diverted into the pockets of doctors. Dr. Cox disputes the inference. He believes, on the contrary, that the incomes of the profession are, on the whole, increased by the traffic in secret remedies—presumably because the injurious effects of the medicines increase the number of people who subsequently are driven to the doctor. The memorandum of evidence put in by the British Medical Association similarly states 'that 'financially the profession gained by the unrestricted use of 'proprietary medicines and preparations.' But this, say opponents, is going too far. Here and there we may find a solitary individual whose philanthropy is such as to embark him upon a course of active propagandism for a purpose that is opposed to his personal interests. But we cannot, they say, credit a whole profession with these disinterested motives—greatly though we may admire its individual members. Still less can we believe that the propagandism would be carried on

with the vigour which we actually witness. It is not easy to believe that the only class in the community which has attacked these remedies is the one class which profits by their sale. We may recollect that the trade guilds of the Middle Ages sought to justify their existence as being to the public interest ; and that the apprenticeship laws were passed in order that the public might be supplied with articles of competent workmanship. Yet we know that the real motive of apprenticeship laws was the maintenance of monopoly in the various branches of trade, by making it illegal to the outside public to enter into competition. The medicine proprietor contends that there is here a close analogy with the action of the medical profession, and demands to be informed of the points of difference. Indeed, he has gone so far in his own defence as to recall the libellous old story of the terrible and ubiquitous malady which is said to have been widely spread by Francis I. in France—a malady which probably brought the larger part of the population, at one time or another, into the doctors' hands : and how for many years physicians visiting Paris used to approach with veneration the statue of Francis, and there give thanks to God for the wide diffusion of that universal disease.

And if it is really philanthropy which impels the profession along a path contrary to their interests, why, asks the proprietor of secret remedies, does not the Association gather itself together for the greatest achievement open to mankind—the prevention of disease ? Why do they not strain every nerve for the extinction of tuberculosis and the other preventible diseases ? Why is the interest in prevention, among the profession at large, chiefly confined to smallpox, where the preventive measures are such as to require every healthy baby born into the world to be delivered into the doctors' hands ? Why does the dentist, who gaily stops a hole in our teeth, not inform us of the measures requisite for preventing the arrival of future holes ?

The exaggeration, and indeed the baselessness, of many of these criticisms of the medical profession will be obvious to every well-informed person ; but it is only fair to the trade that their case should be stated with the same publicity as that of the doctors. The arguments recited, moreover, are not peculiar to the present controversy, but have been repeated from time to time by writers of the highest distinction, from the age of Molière to the age of Mr. Bernard Shaw. But none

of these writers have supported quack medicines. On the other hand, Mr. H. G. Wells has attacked quackery, under the name of ' Tono-Bungay,' with an almost unrivalled satire and insight into character.

Quite a different line of argument in defence of proprietary medicines is put forward in a pamphlet published by the London Chamber of Commerce, which, whatever we may think of its conclusions, states its case with great moderation and fairness. This pamphlet urges that proprietary medicines constitute a system of medication that is unsurpassed for simplicity, uniformity, and cheapness. The public, having learnt that a certain medicine will benefit certain conditions, can obtain that medicine, always of exactly the same composition, at any chemist's in the United Kingdom ' at a mere ' fraction of the cost of the same class of medicine when ob- ' tained through a physician's advice and prescription.'

In 1909, the Privy Council requested the Local Government Board to ascertain from the medical officers of England and Wales whether the practice of medicine and surgery by unqualified persons was assuming large proportions in their districts, and whether such practice was detrimental to the health of their districts. Replies were received from 1600 medical officers of health, and have since been published as a Government Blue Book. The pamphlet of the London Chamber of Commerce points out that only two cases are quoted to prove that some harm had been done by patent medicines, ' one of them in a very vague and indefinite way ' ; the other resting on the ' opinion ' of a doctor. The pamphlet rightly insists that this is an astonishingly good result, in a trade which sells about 50,000,000 medicines a year. Under the ordinary statistical laws, many more accidents might have been anticipated, even with the most careful supervision.

In the evidence before the Parliamentary Committee one or two doctors stated that they had seen injurious results follow the use of proprietary medicines, chiefly by the delay which they caused in visiting a doctor. This judgment is without doubt accurate : yet the formalities of justice demand that details of some of these cases should be placed upon the table, and that the owners of proprietary articles should have a complete opportunity for investigating and replying to them. Considering the fierce and hostile glare that has

been turned on to the trade, it must be confessed that a singularly small amount of injury has been brought to light: and no attempt has been made to compare the extent of that injury with the injury resulting from improper treatment by doctors, or from a mistaken or delayed diagnosis. For even qualified practitioners are not infallible.

It is desirable that attention should here be drawn to a fact which hitherto has been little recognised by those engaged in this discussion—namely, that, as far as the public are concerned, the remedies supplied by doctors are just as secret as those supplied by newspaper advertisers. With doctors who do their own dispensing, there is obviously no difference whatever as regards secrecy. A bottle of medicine is sent to the patient, who consumes it without the vaguest notion of what it may contain. And even with doctors who hand their patients prescriptions the case is not very different. For the prescriptions are worded in an abbreviated form of Latin, unintelligible to those who have never been instructed in the mysteries. A prescription is really a cypher letter of instruction from the doctor to the chemist to deliver certain drugs to the patient. As far as the chemist is concerned, the letter might just as well be written in plain English words. The purpose of this esoteric symbolism is that the patient should not understand it: for if he understood it, he might be tempted into self-medication, the chronic bugbear of the medical profession. Indeed so far is the concealment carried that occasionally a deceptive name for a drug is purposely introduced, as, for instance, when a doctor prescribes opium pills under the title of 'compound pills of soap,' or the Latin equivalent.

Now this dislike of self-medication may fitly occupy us for a moment, as there can be little doubt it lies at the base of the attack upon proprietary medicines. What may be called the extreme official view of the profession is that no man should ever treat himself in any way: that the moment his health fails in the smallest particular, he should place himself unreservedly in the doctor's hands. Dr. Cox, Medical Secretary of the British Medical Association, brings this out clearly in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee. 'Does not 'your evidence mean that no one ought to try a remedy of any 'kind without having his case diagnosed by a medical man?'—

'I do not think we mean that, and I do not think the public 'is likely to take that extreme *counsel of perfection*' (20th of June). And again, on the 25th of June: 'Your point 'is that no one should have treatment without a doctor's pre-'scription?'—'That is a counsel of perfection. I recognise that 'all people could not afford to do that, although it would be the 'best thing if it could be done.' In other words, if you think you want a blue pill, the proper and desirable course (if you can afford it) is to pay your doctor anything from half a crown to a guinea for writing '4 grains of blue pill' in dog-latin hieroglyphics upon a half-sheet of notepaper.* Well, of course that is the trade-union point of view; and it comes naturally from the secretary of the association which exists in order to look after the interests of the profession. But it neither is, nor ever can be, the public point of view: the sentiment for keeping out of the doctor's hands as far as possible appears a healthy one, quite apart from the unwholesome process of fee-paying.

In furtherance of the same purpose, there is a strong body of opinion among doctors that no chemist should make up any prescription more than once. If asked to make up a second bottle, he should refer his customer again to the doctor. These and all similar doctrines are of course urged on the ground of the grave injury which the public may do themselves if they take to their own medication. Indeed on this point the philanthropic sensitiveness of doctors is quite amazing. And doubtless they do well to be sensitive. For with one or two exceptions, drugs do not work the magical results which the public expect from them. The number of really useful drugs is so extremely limited that, were they known by simple English names, an intelligent person would have very little difficulty in mastering the ordinary uses of all of them: and if that elementary knowledge were to become at all general, doctors would almost necessarily suffer. That a physician can cure diseases is (except in one or two cases) a popular superstition. All he can do is to console the patient, while the disease pursues its normal course: and that consolation may take the form of disagreeable beverages or of moral support—which is perhaps the most valuable of all.

We have now run over the cases both for and against 'Secret

---

* Something after this fashion: ℞ Pil. Hydrarg. gr. iiij.

'Remedies.' It remains for us to name some general facts with regard to the trade, and to consider what action, if any, requires to be taken. The existence of a Government duty, requiring every bottle to be labelled with a Government stamp, enables us to judge approximately of the dimensions of the trade. From these figures we may infer also its prosperity: and we may note that there is a tolerably steady rise year by year. For the five years 1899–1903, the average receipts from stamps per annum were £298,483. In the following quinquennium they were £328,048, the returns for 1908 being £335,878. 'Secret Remedies,' which was published in 1908, and has had a circulation of 150,000, appears to have arrested temporarily the progress of the trade, for the quinquennial average from 1907–11 fell to £323,099. Nevertheless, it seems to be rapidly recovering. For the year ending on the 31st of March 1911, the sum of £325,646 was received, showing an increase of £12,532 on the previous year; and for the year ending on the 31st of March 1912, the receipts amounted to £327,856. At present it is said that on the average one new proprietary medicine makes its appearance every week. In America a similar result is observable. According to figures supplied by the Department of Commerce at Washington, U.S.A., the export of proprietary medicines, which stood at £400,000 fifteen years ago, has now grown to £1,400,000, nearly one-third of which is sent to this country.

The absolute sum spent by the public on proprietary medicines cannot be rigidly deduced from these returns. As a result, however, of a careful calculation in 'Secret Remedies,' the figure of £2,422,800 was arrived at as an estimate of the amount spent by the public in the year ending on the 31st of March 1908. There is no doubt that this is a very moderate estimate, and is probably below the mark. This sum would represent a sale in the United Kingdom alone of over 50,000,000 proprietary medicines in the course of a year.

Now the Proprietary Articles Section of the London Chamber of Commerce estimate that the advertising expenditure of their members per annum 'cannot be less than £2,000,000.' This estimate was prepared quite independently of that in 'Secret Remedies'; but a comparison of the two certainly seems to dispose of the suggestion that the prices charged are exorbitant. If the trade spend £2,000,000 and only receive

from the public £2,422,800 it cannot be said that the profit is unjust, and we have to remember that this is only the gross profit. Out of it the proprietor has to pay the cost of the raw materials, the cost of manufacture, the presumed skill of the inventor, the stamp duties, and the retailers' commissions. It cannot therefore be contended that the net profits are too high. It is quite true that an extreme contrast exists between the prices of nostrums and the prime cost of their ingredients ; for the latter is quite one of the least important items of the manufacturer's expenses. Yet it is well to recognise that when we purchase a secret remedy we are in the main paying, not for the drugs, but for the advertisement which brought it to our attention. And it should be noticed that even when we go to a doctor for drugs, his charges have no more reference to the cost of ingredients than in the case of proprietary medicines.

As to the class of people who furnish the market for proprietary medicines, it appears to be a great mistake to assume that the trade is confined to the classes who are unable to afford a doctor. On the contrary, the evidence goes to show that the sale is pretty evenly distributed through the whole population. It is found that members of the upper classes will give testimonials freely to nostrums that are beyond question worthless. Indeed, Mr. Harrison, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee, expressed the view that the more educated classes are as easily gulled as the uneducated. Edwards' Harlene is one of the hair-restorers pilloried in 'More Secret Remedies.' Yet a responsible gentleman has been heard to declare that it caused his hair to grow with such rapidity that he was obliged to dilute the remedy with water.

The class of persons who are entrapped by quack remedies may be gauged from the character of the newspapers to which proprietors have recourse. They are, naturally, to a great extent the less respectable newspapers. The Sunday papers are a great resource : also the low-class 'comics,' and, especially, the religious papers. The author of 'More Secret Remedies' found in one religious weekly eighteen advertisements of secret remedies, along with 'galvanic rings for rheumatism,' '1s. for £1,' '£2 weekly made by selling remnants,' 'blushing 'cured,' 'superfluous hair removed,' etc., and in the same paper

the announcement: 'The prayers of the readers of this journal 'are requested for the blessing of God upon those who 'conduct it, and also upon the sermons and narratives which 'are printed in it.' Mr. Henry Sewill, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee, also expressed the opinion that religious papers were the 'worst offenders.' Sir William Osler writes similarly:

'I suppose, as a body, clergymen are better educated than any other, yet they are notorious supporters of all the nostrums and humbuggery with which the daily and religious papers abound; and I find that the further they have wandered from the decrees of the Council of Trent the more apt are they to be steeped in thaumaturgic and galenical superstition.'

That proprietors of secret remedies are careful to select papers where they are likely to find the largest amount of credulity is evidenced by the fact that such advertisements usually appear in company with others of clairvoyants, palmists, astrologers, preparations for removing superfluous hair, preventing blushing, or developing the bust. These advertisements, moreover, constitute a very valuable property for the selected newspapers: so valuable that there is a real difficulty in disseminating through journalistic agency a knowledge of the futile or harmful nature of advertised drugs. The advertisement of secret remedies has been refused by several newspapers: few besides the 'Spectator' have dared to comment on the exposures. Indeed it is affirmed that many of the newspapers of the country are in the hands of proprietors of medicines to such an extent that they would be compelled very widely to misrepresent any political measures which it was proposed to take for the protection of the public. The immense influence that is brought to bear on newspapers cannot be adequately understood by the outside public.

Having now investigated the main facts concerning the trade, and heard the arguments on both sides, we are in a position to pass on to the ultimate question: What is to be done? Under the present state of the law, vendors of proprietary medicines have to take out annually a licence, with a 5*s.* duty, and a further duty is imposed on every article sold, under the following scale: Value 1*s.*, 1½*d.*; exceeding 1*s.* and not exceeding 2*s.* 6*d.*, 3*d.*; exceeding 2*s.* 6*d.* and not exceeding 4*s.*, 6*d.*;

exceeding 4s. and not exceeding 10s., 1s.; exceeding 10s. and not exceeding £1, 2s.; exceeding £1 and not exceeding £1. 10. 0, 3s. It was found, however, that the Government stamps on proprietary articles were frequently made by proprietors to appear as guarantees. They advertised for instance: 'None genuine unless guaranteed by the Government Stamp.' In recent years therefore the stamp has borne the legend: 'This stamp implies no Government guarantee'; but the suggestion of a guarantee is still sometimes conveyed. Recent examples are 'Protected by His Majesty's Royal Commis-'sioners,' with an exhibition of the Royal Arms; also: 'Owing 'to the excellence of ——'s remedy and to prevent spurious 'imitations, His Majesty's Honourable Commissioners of 'Customs have authorised the name of —— (the proprietor) 'to be printed on the Government Stamp.' Beyond these duties, there is no control whatever of the trade. Let us proceed to consider the various proposals that have been made, with the arguments for and against them.

The main proposal of the British Medical Association is that on every packet of medicine not prescribed by a doctor the name and quantity of each constituent shall be published. The purpose of this publication is that it would no longer be possible to make absurd claims for a commonplace mixture. Mr. Harrison does not go quite so far, though he too would desire the quantities of 'dangerous drugs like acetanilid and 'alcohol' to be printed on the labels so that the public should not unknowingly imbibe a considerable quantity. But in the present state of public ignorance, few purchasers would be much the wiser if they found 'acetanilid' printed on the labels, more especially if its quantity was named in a measure to which they were totally unaccustomed. The proposal is opposed by the trade, on the ground that it would ruin them completely. To destroy the main part of the commerce of secret remedies is no doubt the object of the British Medical Association in making this proposal. Yet we must remember that proprietary medicines have continued to be very valuable paying properties after their secrecy was divulged. Such, for instance, are antipyrin, urotropin, aspirin, adrenine, and 'tabloid' preparations: for the merits of these substances are recognised so widely that they represent a valuable addition to a doctor's pharmacopœia.

The reply of the trade rests on the following principle :

'In the law of this country absolutely the only protection that the proprietor and manufacturer of a proprietary article has is the secret of his formula, which is his own trade secret, and to demand disclosure of such is contrary to one of the fundamental principles of English law. By disclosing his secret his trade-mark rights would become practically worthless.'

They instance Dover's Powders, Gregory's Powders, Warburg's Tincture, Blaud's Pills, Parrish's Chemical Food, Liebig's Extract of Meat, etc., as titles lost through disclosure. We have already shown that by far the largest item in the value of a proprietary medicine is the cost of the advertisement spent on it. The point is that, if the formula were disclosed, any chemist would be able to make it up and thus reap the benefits of advertisements on which he had not spent a penny. In short, advertisement would at once cease to pay : and with the cessation of advertisement, the nostrums themselves would no longer survive.

'The owners and manufacturers of proprietary articles and foods have as much right to the result of their enormous advertising expenditure and work as any other business men, and what right has a section of the medical profession to set out to destroy the valuable properties which have been built up with large capital, great experience, and, in some cases, almost a century of work, by requiring formula disclosure ? The businesses are the personal property and are owned by the proprietors as such, as honestly as any other business or property, and it is not right to take them away unless it can be shown that they are doing harm to the public.'

The trade go on to point out that there is no demand by the public for disclosure. Moreover, while causing respectable firms to cease business, unscrupulous persons might still continue : for nothing could prevent them from giving a misleading formula while including in their nostrums vegetable compounds which would defy analysis. On this point, however, one must venture to express some doubt. A study of Mr. Harrison's work leads to the conclusion that it would demand almost supernatural magic to elude his detection.

The disclosure of formulas has been considered in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa : and in each case has been rejected. It is compulsory, however, in France, Germany, and Italy ; but in France the law is said

to be a dead-letter owing to the absence of a check, and in Germany also it is much evaded. On behalf of the Home Office Mr. Aitken stated before the Parliamentary Committee : ' No ' amendment of the law in the direction of causing the formulas ' of the articles to be placed on the labels would help in any way.' Taking all these facts together, we must come to the same conclusion : that it is neither feasible nor desirable to compel publication of the formulas.

The next proposal is that proprietary medicines should be brought within the scope of the Food and Drugs Act 1875, which imposes a penalty if an article is not of the nature, substance, and quality demanded by the purchaser. Here Mr. Aitken, again speaking for the Home Office, has pointed out the extreme difficulty of proving that the nature, substance, and quality demanded had not been given. It is no good passing a law unless we are able to enforce it, even if the law is in itself good.

But why, it may be asked, are there not already public prosecutions in cases where the fraud is obvious ? It is a matter admitting of no dispute that rupture, for instance, being due to mechanical or anatomical causes, is not curable by medication. If then a proprietor sells a medicine on the ground that it will cure rupture, why should he not be prosecuted for obtaining money under false pretences ? The reason alleged by the Home Office throws a very curious light on the class of persons who have to be dealt with. The difficulty of proving fraud is found to be almost insuperable. For however unanimous scientific opinion may be as to the impossibility that a drug should effect the cure claimed for it, there appear always to come forward a number of persons of respectability who declare that they have been cured. To make the case indictable it is necessary to prove not merely that the drug is valueless, but that its advertisers knew it to be valueless : and that can never be done so long as respectable people are prepared to forward testimonials to the vendor as to the benefit which the drug has done them. It was in this way that the Harness case broke down in 1893–94. Exactly the same thing has been found in America, where ' misbranding ' was made an offence, and it was made illegal to state that a remedy would cure a disease if the medical profession knew that it would not. But a case was taken to the Supreme Court,

which decided that it was a matter of opinion whether a remedy would or would not cure a disease; and since that time no prosecutions have been brought.

Must we then conclude that nothing can be done to check fraud in the trade of proprietary medicines? To quote Mr. Aitken once again: 'The view of the Home Office has been 'that the advertisement and extensive sale of proprietary 'medicines was a mischief, but that it was an evil which must 'be met rather by the spread of education than by legislation.' To that opinion all impartial inquirers must on the whole subscribe. For such educational work the two publications of the British Medical Association are admirably adapted; and the Association is to be warmly congratulated on their success and the public advantage ensuing from them.

Moreover we must note that the harm done by proprietary medicines is singularly small. There may be cases of people who have unwittingly fallen into alcoholism through the agency of medicated wines. This eventuality might be met by causing a notice to be placed on bottles stating the alcoholic character of the contents, just as is now done in the case of poisons. But the damage chiefly asserted by the Medical Association is indirect, namely that ensuing from a delay in going to see a doctor. The argument is that the patient fancies he is being treated, and thereby loses valuable or vital time. But it may be held as a very sound principle of legislation that people shall not be unduly sheltered from their own folly. If anyone takes a medicine merely because an advertisement says it is good, he is a person whose education is very incomplete; and in these days of eugenic agitation for the suppression of the unfit, we may even look upon such advertisements as performing a useful function, in weeding out the credulous. If a person feeling ill prefers to buy a nostrum rather than visit a doctor, that is his affair, not Parliament's: it cannot be just to legislate to suppress the nostrum and leave him only the doctor as an alternative. And there is little reason to believe in any extensive damage of this kind. Probably a very large number of the nostrums on the market are bought by people who only think they are ill: the consumption of the nostrum causes them subsequently to think they are well again, and what more could a doctor have done for them? The power of faith in working cures is universally admitted to be of immense

importance. If nostrums excite faith where doctors do not, are they not to some extent justified?

But, again, it is said that diseased persons cannot be treated as ordinary healthy beings: they require special protection from fraud, since they are liable to be specially credulous and unversed in the guiles of the world. No doubt there is much truth in this. As Sir Clifford Allbutt says in his 'System of 'Medicine': 'In few countries has the art of healing ever 'been free from superstition.' It is said, moreover, that it is a cruelty to hold out false hopes of cure to one whose case has been diagnosed as incurable. But is that so? A drowning man clutches at straws; and if we cannot rescue him from the waters, there is surely no conspicuous philanthropy in the endeavour to remove all straws from within his reach, lest he should clutch at them.

Further, it is to be noted that the new Insurance Act furnishes a powerful incentive to the poor to go to their doctors rather than buy nostrums. For they get their doctor free, while for the nostrums they have to pay a high price.

In the main, therefore, we must fall back on the principle of *caveat emptor*; but it seems possible that a good deal more might be done towards prosecuting the proprietors of medicines who deceive the public into purchasing articles of fraudulent character. If such prosecutions would be rendered easier by bringing proprietary medicines within the scope of the Food and Drugs Act 1875, that should be done. In the meanwhile, the public would be well advised to have nothing to do with secret remedies, either proprietary or prescribed. They would be well advised also to purchase 'Secret Remedies' and 'More 'Secret Remedies,' which are not merely amusing and admirable volumes, but throw an interesting light on human nature.

In considering more broadly how to deal with the problem of proprietary medicines we are necessarily guided by our general political outlook. Fraud and all kinds of wrong-doing may be dealt with in many different ways. It is the custom of the present day to endeavour to prevent wrong-doing by establishing a general system of ticketing and inspection, by which all men are placed under supervision and the commission of fraud rendered difficult. This method has never recommended itself to the *Edinburgh Review*, which has always been inclined to the opinion that the

business of the State is to maintain justice and to repress crime by punishment, rather than by submitting innocent persons to preventive supervision or inspection. We can safely adhere to this opinion until some evidence is forthcoming to show that the system of universal inspection is satisfactory, or produces the results hoped for from it. Specially ought we to oppose the method of inspection when it can be shown that this method inflicts definite injury on innocent persons: and such is the case with many of the proposals for dealing with proprietary medicines. For instance, the proposed compulsory publication of ingredients would certainly inflict damage on the whole trade, and ruin on a large section of it. Such a measure cannot be justified by the mere fact that fraud exists in the trade: it could only be justified by proof that the entire trade is bad. To injure the whole, lest a part should deal fraudulently, is not only unjust but is a reflection on our administrative system: an admission of failure in the suppression of fraud. What is really wanted is administrative rather than legislative reform. But ultimately nothing can do much good, except public enlightenment and progressive release from credulity and superstition. We may then look upon the campaign against secret remedies as part of a greater whole; for the dissipation of credulity prepares the way for the onward march of science and for the progress of true civilisation.

HUGH S. ELLIOT.

SIR WILLIAM HERSCHEL

The Scientific Papers of Sir William Herschel. Including early papers hitherto unpublished, collected and edited under the direction of a joint committee of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society, with a biographical introduction compiled mainly from unpublished material. By J. L. E. DREYER. London: published by the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society, and sold by Dulau and Co., Ltd. 1912.

THE publication of the collected papers of Sir William Herschel has an importance and a significance quite unusual in such an enterprise. Herschel's fame needs no memorial edition; the republication of his papers has not been undertaken as a pious duty, but for the much more remarkable reason that these papers, written more than a century ago, are really wanted to-day by many students to whom the originals are nearly inaccessible. With the re-awakening of interest in cosmical astronomy, which has marked the last few years, has come a new appreciation of the value of Herschel's work and of the merit of his views on the construction of the heavens. His knowledge of the contents of the sky was unique. No one since his time can claim an equal acquaintance with the scenery of the star clouds and of the shoals of nebulæ; and we think that no one has pondered over these broad views of the sky with more profundity of common sense. Therefore, when we are called on to form an opinion of modern universe laws, with all their statistical apparatus and their mathematical elegance, we do well to read again the conclusions of the explorer who reflected deeply on what he saw, and who was not tempted to suppose that the law of the Universe could be expressed in a single formula.

The appearance of this edition is to be welcomed for the further reason that Dr. Dreyer has had access to the journals and records preserved in the family archives, and the introduction which he has written allows us to fill in the considerable vacancies previously existing in the story of Herschel's life. The editor has made no attempt to write history, but is content to supply so far as possible what is not found in the 'Memoirs of Caroline Herschel,' and in the other sources hitherto

available. The principal source of his new information is a manuscript journal written by Herschel at some date later than 1793. Let us see how this supplements or modifies the accepted story of his early life.

We learn for the first time some details of his first visit to England, as a boy of eighteen, in the band of the Hanoverian Guards. His sister records only that he brought back with him to Hanover a copy of Locke, on which he had spent all his small pay. The now published journal adds some details of importance. The regiment was quartered in various towns of Kent. At Maidstone :

'I applied myself to learn the English language and soon was enabled to read Locke on Human Understanding. From Maidstone we marched to Coxheath, where the Hanoverian troops were encamped. Here as well as at Maidstone my father, my eldest brother and myself made several valuable acquaintances with families that were fond of music, and which on mine and my brother's return to England proved of great service to us. During our stay in camp we took leave of absence for a short visit to view London.'

After a few months the regiment was ordered back to Hanover, and in the spring of the following year Herschel saw service in the campaign which opened the Seven Years' War. The regiment suffered severely at the battle of Hastenbeck, being involved in the retreat of Cumberland before the forces of Marshal d'Estrées. Unable to endure the hardships of the campaign, Herschel found means to leave the army, under circumstances which have been obscure hitherto, and have given rise to a legend—'too long and too readily believed'—that he deserted from the army.

Herschel's journal gives the following version of the affair :

'About the time of the battle of Hastenbeck (July 26) we were so near the field of action as to be within the reach of gunshot ; when this happened my father advised me to look to my own safety. Accordingly I left the engagement and took the road to Hanover, but when arrived there I found that having no passport I was in danger of being pressed for a soldier ; it was therefore thought proper for me to return to the army. When I had rejoined the regiment I found that nobody had time to look after the musicians ; they did not seem to be wanted. The weather was uncommonly hot and the continual marches were very harassing. At last in September my father's opinion was, that as on account of my youth I had not been sworn in when I was admitted to the

guards I might leave the military service ; indeed he had no doubt but that he could obtain my dismission, and this he after some time actually procured (in 1762) from General Spörcken who succeeded General Sommerfeld.'

At this point the editor interrupts Herschel's narrative to point out that the existence of the formal discharge puts an end to the legend that he deserted from the army, and he prints in full the document, whereby ' Friederich Wilhelm ' Herschell, gebürtig von Hannover, 25 Jahre alt, blondt ' von Haaren, Langer Statur . . .' is commended for his services and granted his discharge.

The date of Herschel's arrival in England is not known precisely, but it must have been in November 1757. Of his life there until 1760 nothing has been known hitherto, and his biographers have assumed that it was a hard struggle for a bare living. The journal gives a happier account :

' When we arrived in London we made use of the recommendation of some of the families we had been known to when we were in England before. We were introduced to some private concerts, my brother attended some scholars and I copied music, by which means we contrived to live pretty comfortably in the winter, and in the summer we visited some families in and near Maidstone and Rochester and had a concert at Tunbridge Wells.'

In 1760 William Herschel found himself in difficulties. London was overstocked with musicians, and he felt that he had little chance of success. His brother Jacob obtained a good appointment, and, as usual, relied upon William to supply the means of furnishing him for the post. But very opportunely, the ' Memorandums ' tell us, he received an offer to go into Yorkshire, where the Earl of Darlington wanted a good musician to be at the head of a small band for a regiment of Militia of which he was the Colonel.

Six busy years were spent in the North of England, at Richmond, at Sunderland, at Halnaby near Darlington, at Newcastle, Pontefract, and Leeds. Six comfortable and fairly prosperous years they seem to have been, with long stays at the seat of Sir Ralph and Lady Milbank at Halnaby, and with Sir George and Lady Cook at Wheatley, where his mare, ' standing idly in the stable, and being overfed by Sir Bryan's ' grooms, died.' Eighteen symphonies were composed during these years, and he relates, in a letter to Dr. Hutton, that

'during all this time, though it afforded not much leisure for 'study I had not forgot my former plan, but had given all my 'leisure hours to the study of languages.' Italian and Latin were mastered; Greek took up too much of his leisure, and was abandoned; the study of harmony led to mathematics; Dr. Smith's 'Harmonics' led naturally in time to the same writer's famous treatise on Optics; and so we may find a trace of the path which led to astronomy and to telescopes. There is no more than this slight trace. In 1766, February 19, we have this one note: 'Wheatley, Observation of Venus.' Five days afterwards he records an eclipse of the moon, seen at Kirby; and then there is no further mention of astronomy for seven years.

We had hoped to find in these records some indication of the growth of that resolution recorded by Herschel himself, in the well-known letter to the 'Göttingen Magazin der Wissen-'schaften und Literatur' (1783), 'henceforth to devote myself 'wholly to those sciences from the pursuit of which I alone 'looked for all my future happiness and enjoyment.' There is no indication; and it seems possible that the resolve was not in reality adopted until later. But we do find in this account of the years in the North of England the growth of the graceful and accomplished gentleman who held his scientific court in after-years by the King's Court at Windsor.

In 1766 Herschel held for a few weeks the post of organist at Halifax; but he was already engaged to go to Bath, where for six years more he was a successful organist, composer, conductor, and teacher, making an income which rose in a few years to some four hundred pounds per annum, and giving yet no sign of any interest in the heavenly bodies. Then in the journal comes the sudden entry: '1773, April 19. Bought a 'quadrant and Emerson's Trigonometry.' His sister Caroline has recorded the 'uncommon precipitancy which accompanied 'all his actions.' Possibly the purchase of the quadrant was a sudden inspiration; at least from that moment the inspiration never failed. On May 10 he bought a book of astronomy and another of astronomical tables; on May 24 an object glass of ten feet focal length; on June 1 he bought many eyeglasses and made tin tubes; and on June 14 he hired a two-foot reflecting telescope for three months.

Thus, in 1772, Herschel found himself embarked on a voyage

of discovery with such instruments as he could construct from the materials then obtainable. Let us glance at the state of telescope-making at the time, that we may the better appreciate the difficulties he had to face. It was an age of stagnation in telescopic discovery. Progress with the refracting telescope had been checked for nearly a century by the extreme difficulty of manipulating the long instruments with a single lens for objective. The achromatic objective had been invented ; but the impossibility of procuring the necessary discs of flint glass had delayed its coming into use, and it is improbable that in 1773 an achromatic objective of more than two inches aperture could have been bought. In the course of the eighteenth century some progress had been made in the construction of reflecting telescopes after the models of Newton and of Gregory ; opticians such as Hearne or Short were able to supply instruments of apertures up to about six inches, though doubtless at a high price. These were useful instruments of their kind ; and we think that if Grant was right in saying that no discovery had ever been made with the reflecting telescope, the fault lay not so much with the opticians as with the observers, who lacked the courage really to try what could be done with them. The faculty of telescopic discovery is in truth one of the rarest of faculties ; for just as no one had possessed it in any marked degree in the twenty or thirty years before the time of Herschel, so not one of those who in after years bought telescopes made by him succeeded in doing anything considerable with them.

Herschel's early attempts at telescope-making were directed to the building of a refractor on the Huyghenian plan, as is evident from the purchase of the object glass of ten feet focal length, and from the account given by his sister of her making tubes of pasteboard, which were too weak and were replaced by tin. A few weeks' experience of the inconvenience of these long unrigid tubes showed that little could be done until the instrument was made more manageable by shortening it. When there was no possibility of getting an achromatic objective, his thoughts, guided by Dr. Smith's celebrated treatise on Optics, turned naturally to the idea of a reflecting telescope. We learn from his sister that he wrote to enquire the price of a reflecting telescope of seven feet, that is to say, with an aperture of about six or seven inches ; but the price asked was so much

beyond his means that he determined to make his telescope with his own hands. Those who have always been curious to know how Herschel learned all the tricks of the process of grinding, figuring, and polishing mirrors will read with interest the chapter of Dr. Dreyer's introduction which tells what he has been able to find in the journal and papers.

Herschel's sister has recorded that 'about this time he 'bought of a Quaker resident in Bath, who formerly had made 'attempts at polishing mirrors, all his rubbish of patterns, tools, 'hones, polishers, unfinished mirrors, etc., but all for small 'Gregorians, and none above two or three inches diameter.' The now published journal completes the story thus :

'I was informed that there lived in Bath a person who amused himself with repolishing and making reflecting mirrors. Having found him out he offered to let me have all his tools and some half-finished mirrors, as he did not intend to do any more work of that kind. The 22nd September when I bought his apparatus, it was agreed that he should also show me the manner in which he had proceeded with grinding and polishing his mirrors, and going to work with these tools I found no difficulty to do in a few days all what he could show me, his knowledge indeed being very confined. About the 21st October I had some mirrors cast for a two feet reflector, the mixture of the metal was according to a receipt I had obtained with the tools. It was at the rate of 32 copper, 13 tin, and one of Regulus of Antimony, and I found it to make a very good, sound, white metal. In the beginning of November I had other mirrors cast, among them was one intended for a $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet Gregorian reflector, and as soon as they were ground and figured as well as I could do them, I proceeded to the work of polishing. About the middle of December I got so far as to give a tolerable gloss to some of the metals, and having advanced considerably in this work it became necessary to think of mounting these mirrors.'

We think that in some respects this passage is the most valuable of all that have been extracted from the journal by the editor of these papers. Amateur mechanics know the difficulty of starting on an operation of an entirely new kind, for which every one of the numberless small requirements has to be collected from all kinds of sources. Succeed in getting through the process once, on however small a scale, and progress is relatively easy. Doubtless the Quaker's rubbish of patterns, etc., looked a sorry collection to the eye of Caroline the housekeeper, and the Quaker's knowledge was as small

as it seemed to Herschel's recollection in after years ; but they gave him the opportunity of making a start, and astronomy owes much to the chance which produced, at the right moment, a mirror-maker ready to dispose of his humble tools and his humble knowledge.

The process of grinding and polishing mirrors remains to this day very empirical. A convex grinding tool of the desired curvature is worked backwards and forwards over the mirror disc, while emery of successively finer grades is introduced between the tool and the mirror. The particles of emery are held, or partly embedded, in the soft tool, and thus are enabled to cut away the harder mirror in much the same way that a soft disc of tin plate, charged with diamond dust, makes a circular saw to cut slices of the hardest rocks. Herschel worked the mirror on the tool ; in modern practice the tool is worked on the mirror. In either case the nicety of figure given to the mirror depends entirely on the nature and range of the stroke, and the proportion between the sizes of the mirror and the tool. The first aim of the grinder is to produce a true spherical surface ; the excessively small alteration which transforms it into the ultimate paraboloid is achieved by a small change in the character of the stroke. The effect of any alteration cannot be predicted except by a kind of acquired instinct, and cannot be determined except by optical tests ; for the difference between a good figure and a bad is much smaller than can be measured by any mechanical means.

For fifteen years Herschel operated his grinding and polishing tools by hand, and hand-working does not allow of any exact knowledge of the various component parts which make the whole stroke. Of systematic methods in testing he had none. He made great numbers of mirrors, keeping a careful record of the work done on each. As they were finished he put them in the telescope tube, and tried them on fine print set up at a distance. The best were reserved for the more delicate test on stars ; the rest went back to the workshop for refiguring. In this purely tentative way he gained by slow degrees a feeling for the kind of stroke that would produce the desired change, a skill entirely personal which could not be communicated to another.

With increase in the size of the mirrors with which he worked it was no longer possible for the strength of a single man to

give to the grinding and polishing tools the necessary steady and long-continued motions. It became essential to invent machinery for the purpose. A paper sent to the Royal Society in 1789, but for some reason never published until now, gives an excellent account of the difficulties in hand polishing the second mirror for the great forty-foot telescope, which compelled him to have recourse to machinery.

'The idea of a machine was now again as it were forced upon me; when I considered, that all the essential part, I had formerly taken in the construction of a speculum, was fairly excluded in the present operation. The enormous weight, of about five and twenty hundred pounds, to be moved upon the polisher, would not permit the use of those delicate touches of the hand, by which I had been accustomed to form small mirrors; and I found myself reduced to the situation of merely directing the unwieldy manœuvres of a set of men, who when they did their best, could only act like a very imperfect machine.

'As soon as I perceived that I was in fact already working with a machine, there wanted not much to convince me that twenty men made a very bad one; and that I should find no manner of difficulty in contriving another, that would do the work much more to my satisfaction. This point being brought home to me with such forcible arguments, I caused all my apparatus for polishing with the twenty-men-machine to be pulled to pieces that I might never be tempted to use it again; and began now to consult the very compleat theory of polishing, which long experience had furnished me with.'

The construction of the polishing machine was accomplished at the end of 1788. Within a few weeks its peculiarities were mastered, and a larger machine was made to fashion the four-foot mirror of the great telescope, which in the following August celebrated its perfection by the discovery of a sixth satellite of the planet Saturn.

It is somewhat remarkable that the editor does not anywhere inform us whether any part of the 'very compleat theory 'of polishing' is to be found in the four volumes of the 'Ex-'periments on the Construction of Specula,' recording no less than 2160 separate pieces of work performed on specula between the years 1773 and 1818. Perhaps the system was never committed to writing, but remained the secret of the brain which devised it, until in the last years some part of it was communicated to Sir John Herschel to enable him to continue in

the Southern Hemisphere the work that his father had done so completely for the Northern.

Dr. Dreyer goes so far as to suggest that Herschel disclosed nothing of his methods because he considered them a lucrative trade secret not to be revealed. It is true that he received considerable sums of money by the sale of his instruments. A twenty-five-foot instrument for the King of Spain brought in £3150; and he gives a list, written from memory, and admittedly incomplete, which totals no less than £14,743. But it seems to us very doubtful if the proceeds of selling telescopes did more than defray the cost of maintaining in activity the workshops which were essential to Herschel for the prosecution of his own work. Undoubtedly an account of his methods would have been very valuable to Lord Rosse and to Lassell, who were forced to re-invent for themselves much of what Herschel might have told them. Yet we must remember that the most difficult part of the process was incommunicable in writing; and those who would complain that the secret was not handed down should perhaps enquire whether any would-be telescope maker applied in vain to Sir John Herschel, who was possessed of all that could be transmitted of his father's art.

The surprising activity of the years between 1773, when Herschel began to make mirrors, and 1789, when he finished the great telescope, makes it far from easy to gain a clear idea of the relation between the various telescopes which he employed and the principal researches he carried through. One fact should be kept clearly in mind: the work actually done with the great telescope was relatively small. This telescope discovered the sixth satellite of Saturn, but there is no record that it was turned on to the two real and the four supposed satellites of Uranus, except for three observations on those bodies in the second paper. Very few observations of nebulæ were made with it, and none of the systematic work on those objects, which remains the most valuable and the least surpassed of all Herschel's work. It is worth while to enquire what explanation there can be of the little use to which the masterpiece was put. Dr. Dreyer deals pretty fully with this question in his introduction, putting forward several interesting suggestions which may partially solve the difficulty.

In the first place, the mirror was made of an alloy much poorer in tin than the metal used for Herschel's other specula.

Several attempts to cast with the usual mixture were unsuccessful, the speculum cracking during the cooling. The addition of more copper resulted in a successful casting, but the success was dearly bought, for the mirror tarnished very quickly, and its polish required frequent renewal.

The great disadvantage of metal specula is that repolishing means refiguring, so that the most delicate and tedious part of the whole process of mirror-making has to be repeated at each repolishing. This in itself must have made the great telescope a very exhausting instrument, especially when we remember that the speculum weighed a ton, and that Herschel had no more effective means of testing its figure than hoisting it into position in the tube and trying it on terrestrial objects or on stars. The method now used, of arranging the polishing machine so that the mirror can be turned up and tested optically at any stage of the process, was at that time quite unknown; the process devised by Foucault came half a century later.

A second reason that may account for Herschel's general disinclination to use the great telescope was its unhandiness. Two men were required to turn it, and it is likely that after it had stood in the weather for a few years it was excessively hard to move. Moreover, the longer the telescope the greater the necessary movement of the observer to keep himself at the eyepiece while the telescope follows the star in the field, the more running up and down long ladders, the greater fatigue. Herschel himself has stated that he made it a rule never to employ the great telescope when it was possible to use a smaller; and it seems to be likely that he was often very dissatisfied with the performance of the large mirror. We may, indeed, say with certainty that the mirror could rarely or never have done justice to itself, for its support was totally inadequate to preserve its figure.

The great telescope was in fact too far in advance of the mechanical possibilities of the time, and it came rather too late in its maker's life. The extraordinary strength and determination which allowed him to observe all night after an exhausting day's polishing cannot have remained unimpaired as he passed middle age. The man who ate with a pencil in his hand and a project in his head was the kind of man to exhaust the hardiest constitution; not even Herschel escaped the fate of those who systematically overtax their strength. His sister

tells continually of the strain imposed on him by the visits of parties from the Court, who, like less exalted visitors in more modern times, consider that the office of astronomer is created to entertain them. On one evening in particular, the 14th of October 1806,

'his nerves received a shock of which he never got the better afterwards; for on that day he had hardly dismissed his troop of men when visitors assembled, and from the time it was dark till past midnight he was on the grass-plot surrounded by between fifty and sixty persons, without having had time for putting on proper clothing, or for the least nourishment passing his lips. Among the company I remember were the Duke of Sussex, Prince Galitzin, Lord Darnley, a number of officers, Admiral Boston, and some ladies.'

From this time we read of illness, of his life being despaired of in the following spring, of the necessity for holidays, and of his strength not being equal to the labour required for polishing forty-foot mirrors. Very late in his life he received the official recognition of Knighthood in the Guelphic Order, thirty-four years after he had been made the royal astronomer, and long after most of the learned bodies of the world, with the strange exceptions of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, had enrolled his name in their most honourable places. There is little in the now published journals which does more than confirm the account of his later years which his sister Caroline gave in her Memoirs, justly celebrated and widely known. One personal detail we believe is new: the astronomer was naturalised an Englishman in 1793 under the name of William, his baptismal name being Friedrich Wilhelm; which fact we commend to the notice of pedantic cataloguers, who are fond of giving his name as Frederick William.

When we turn from the history of his life to examine the collected papers of this great man, we find no difficulty in selecting those which not only justify but demand republication.

The papers which are of real present value are those dealing with the 'Construction of the Heavens.' The phrase was one of those which displeased this Review in its first volume: and was described as an example of that 'idle 'fondness for inventing names, without any manner of 'occasion . . . and a use of novel and affected idioms.'

The first paper in which this offending phrase occurs contains two ideas which determined the direction of speculation for many years: the probability that all the nebulæ might be resolved into stars with an instrument of sufficient power; and the possibility of explaining the galaxy as an aggregation of stars in the shape of a cloven disc. These ideas survived for long after their author had seen that they must be profoundly modified if not abandoned. The most considerable difficulty in forming a just appreciation of Herschel's work arises from the persistence with which these early speculations have been represented as his mature conclusions. In a summary review of the long series of papers devoted to the construction of the heavens we shall do well to confine our attention so far as possible to tracing the development of these two themes: the nature of the nebulæ and the form of the galaxy of stars.

Messier's catalogue of nebulæ described a great number of these objects as 'nébuleuses sans étoiles,' which under the powerful scrutiny of Herschel's telescope were resolved into stars; and many others showed a kind of mottled appearance, which suggested resolvability. Thus arose the theory that all nebulosity might be resolved into stars were the optical power sufficient for its minute examination. It was a probable view, which turned out to be wrong, and Herschel very soon saw that it was wrong. His successors, less acute, wasted much time and effort in trying to maintain the position, which could not be maintained in its entirety, but from which they were not driven till the invention of the spectroscopic method some fifty years ago. It will be interesting to follow the steps by which Herschel convinced himself that his first position was not tenable. As to the form of the galaxy, its most conspicuous feature is the rift which cleaves it in two through the constellations of Cygnus and Aquila. The general line of the galaxy is so nearly a great circle of the celestial sphere, and so little different in brightness at opposite points, that one can hardly avoid the conclusion first stated by Kepler, that the Sun is not far from the centre of the galaxy. The breadth of the galaxy is not so diverse in its various parts as to lead us [illegible]ay from the obvious idea of a flat stratum of stars, containing the Sun, and in its further parts forming the Milky Way. Some such working hypothesis was inevitable; the merit, such as

it is, of enunciating it first seems to belong to Thomas Wright, of Durham, who published in 1750 his 'Original Theory or 'New Hypothesis of the Universe, Founded upon the Laws of 'Nature, and solving by Mathematical Principles the General 'Phænomena of the Visible Creation; and particularly The 'Via Lactea. Comprised in nine familiar letters from the 'Author to his Friend.'

This simple and plausible working hypothesis was adopted from Wright by Kant, whose 'Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und 'Theorie des Himmels,' published in 1755, contains most of the ideas which have been the stock-in-trade of cosmogony, and especially of the vague and grandiose kind of cosmogony, from Kant's day to ours. Kant found an analogy between the nearly plane arrangement of the Solar System and the nearly plane system of the stars by which he would explain the galaxy. He argued for the existence of a central Sun; and he supposed the few nebulæ known at that time were external galaxies. These galaxies in their turn might be units in a system of galaxies and so *ad infinitum.*

Somewhat similar, and equally grandiose, were the theories put forward by Lambert, to whom indeed this kind of theorising is generally ascribed. His views differ from those of Kant in one important respect; he introduces one additional step between the Sun and the Milky Way, by supposing that the Sun and the stars about him form a system of the 'second 'order'; and that many of these systems of the second order, ranged more or less in one plane, form the Milky Way, a system of the third order. Thence he proceeds to systems of higher orders, on the same lines as those of Kant.

It is clear that Herschel need have been in no want of hypotheses on which to try his facts—hypotheses built on speculation with a mere ha'porth of visible capital behind. The working hypothesis which he adopted was the simplest, that of Wright's disc, but with the modification that to account for the bifurcation of the Milky Way he supposed the disc cloven in such a way that the Sun lay in the angle of the cleft. The resolvability of the nebulæ into stars, and the cloven disc theory of the Milky Way, appear in that first paper which we mentioned before undertaking this little excursus on the speculative cosmogony of the time. It will now be our task to trace the steps by which he strengthened his grasp of the facts and

loosened his hold on the speculative hypotheses until they fell away discarded.

The famous method of star-gauging, propounded in the first paper of June 1784, is fully described in a second paper which followed the first within a few months. Observationally it consists in nothing more than counting the number of stars visible in the field of a certain eyepiece of low power on the reflector of eighteen inches aperture and twenty feet focal length. Granting that the stars are distributed uniformly in space and ignoring any consideration of the apparent brightness of the stars which are counted, it is possible to estimate the depth to which the view has penetrated from the number of stars that have been seen. Working on this assumption, and taking as his unit of distance the distance of Sirius from the Sun, Herschel calculated that when there were ten stars in the field the 'visual ray' extended to 127 units, and when there were 500 stars it reached to 471 units. By a selection from the first list of 683 gauges, the greater part of which depended on accounts in ten consecutive fields, he constructed the well-known figure of the section across the universe, in which its greatest extension is shown as some five times its least, and the cleft is well marked. Now in view of the importance which has, quite unjustifiably, been attached to this result, as the presumed expression of its author's matured views, it is essential to remark that Herschel from the very first was fully conscious of the insecure character of his premisses. He is careful to preface the enunciation of his problem with the words :

> 'The stars being supposed to be very nearly equally scattered . . . '; and later : 'I would not be understood to lay a greater stress on these and the following calculations than the principles on which they are founded will permit ; and if hereafter we shall find reason, from experience and observation, to believe that there are parts of our system where the stars are not scattered in the manner here supposed, we ought then to make proper exceptions.' And finally we read : 'This subject being so new, I look upon what is here given partly as only an example to illustrate the spirit of the method.'

The distinguished author could not have been more careful to guard against misunderstanding of his position in regard to this method of star-gauging ; yet he has in fact been persistently

misunderstood. For this it would seem that his son, Sir John, is responsible. He reproduces, in his 'Outlines of Astro-'nomy' the figure of the cloven disc; he describes the method of gauging and discusses the interpretation of the gauges without any indication of the fact that they cannot be applied to the purpose for which they were devised; he describes how he himself has extended the application of the method to the Southern Hemisphere. It is true that he shows in many places that he no longer relies on the original assumption of a nearly uniform distribution of the stars. He admits the existence of discontinuous masses and clouds of stars in the Milky Way. Yet he cannot be acquitted of a singular blindness to the complete change of view which his father expressed quite clearly in his later work. The paper of 1785 gave the results of 683 gauges. Over 400 more were made, but were never published until 1884, when Professor Holden, then Director of the Washburn Observatory at Madison, U.S.A., obtained a copy of them from the Herschel family, and printed them in the second volume of the publications of his observatory.

It is clear enough that Herschel did not publish these results because he saw very soon that they could not be used in the manner that he had intended. He does not make use of the star gauges in his later papers, and it is exceedingly unfortunate that the method of star-gauging and the cloven-disc theory of the Universe which resulted from it should have been so often placed in the front rank of his performances. We find in his papers the most conclusive evidence that they should be treated rather as early indiscretions of which he soon repented, and which in after life he unhesitatingly and unequivocally abjured.

Let us turn to his further investigation of the nebulæ, restricting ourselves of necessity, for the subject is immense, to our purpose of tracing the after history of the original supposition, that with an instrument of sufficient power all the nebulæ could be resolved into stars. Already in the second paper we find that he has distinguished between three different kinds of nebulosity: the resolvable, the coloured but irresolvable, and a tincture of the milky kind; yet it is clear that he still regards these three distinctions of appearance as caused by differences of distance, and he has not yet found reason to

abandon the idea that all nebulosity is due to multitudes of stars.

'To the inhabitants of the nebulæ of the present catalogue (he writes in 1786) our sidereal system must appear either as a small nebulous patch; an extended streak of milky light; a large resolvable nebula; a very compressed cluster of minute stars hardly discernible; or as an immense collection of large scattered stars of different sizes. And either of these appearances will take place with them according as their own situation is more or less remote from ours.'

During these years Herschel's observing activity was at its highest. In 1789 a catalogue of a second thousand nebulæ appeared, and then for a while, on the completion of the great telescope, the sweeps for nebulæ were laid aside. The discovery of Saturn's sixth and seventh satellites, and the long series of measures consequent on this discovery, absorbed him for a year; in 1791 he returned to the nebulæ with a fresh mind, and immediately there comes a result of capital importance which marks the turning-point of his views. He discovered a star of about the eighth magnitude surrounded with a faintly luminous atmosphere of considerable extent. The paper in which this is announced, 'On nebulous stars, properly so 'called,' exhibits in perfection Herschel's masterly lucidity in the discussion of his material. The new object appears to be of a very instructive nature such as may lead to important inferences. He reviews the steps by which he has passed from the Milky Way, consisting entirely of stars, to clusters in which the stellar points were smaller, yet still clearly distinguishable, and so to nebulous spots in which no trace of a star could be seen. But then the gradations from the former to the latter were by such well-connected steps as left no room for doubt that all these appearances were occasioned by stars.

'When I pursued these researches I was in the situation of a natural philosopher who follows the various species of animals and insects from the height of their perfection down to the lowest ebb of life; when, arriving at the vegetable kingdom, he can scarcely point out to us the precise boundary where the animal ceases and the plant begins; and may even go so far as to suspect them not to be essentially different. But recollecting himself, he compares, for instance, one of the human species to a tree, and all doubt upon the subject vanishes before him. . . . A glance like that of the naturalist, who casts his eye from the perfect animal to the

perfect vegetable, is wanting to remove the veil from the mind of the astronomer. The object I have mentioned above, is the phænomenon that was wanting for this purpose. View, for instance, the nineteenth cluster of my sixth class, and afterwards cast your eye on this cloudy star, and the result will be no less decisive than that of the naturalist we have alluded to. Our judgment, I may venture to say, will be, that the nebulosity about the star is not of a starry nature.'

The star is involved in a 'shining fluid, of a nature totally 'unknown to us.' Granting the existence of such a fluid, he asks himself if it may not exist apart from stars? Has it been too hastily surmised that all milky nebulosity, of which there is so much in the heavens, is owing to starlight only? Can one not explain the Orion nebula much better by this luminous fluid than by the clustering of stars at a distance? Seventy years afterwards Huggins' spectroscope showed that these milky nebulæ are gaseous.

Within the limits of a review it is not possible to follow out in detail the change that came over Herschel's opinions when he had passed the turning-point of the year 1791. For a time he wrote little on the construction of the heavens. Then in 1802 he published the final catalogue of new nebulæ and clusters; and it is to be noticed that after 1790 he observed very few clusters. The short introduction to this concluding section is important for its indications of gradually changing opinions.

'Though our sun, and all the stars we see, may truly be said to be in the plane of the milky-way, yet I am now convinced, by a long inspection and continued examination of it, that the milky-way itself consists of stars very differently scattered from those which are immediately about us.' Or again: 'The stars of which it is composed are very unequally scattered, and shew evident marks of clustering together into many separate allotments.'

The 'sweeps' were now finished. From the year 1802 Herschel devoted his nebula nights, when the moon was absent, to the critical examination of the more important objects that had passed before him rapidly in the strenuous hours of sweeping. In 1811 he published a paper which is, in our opinion, the most masterly of all his works: 'Astronomical 'Observations relating to the construction of the Heavens, 'arranged for the Purpose of a Critical Examination. . . .'

With the *expertise* of a collector at his cabinet, Herschel

selects and arranges his objects, turns them over and criticises them, marks this as a perfect example of its class, and that as doubtful, perhaps spurious. His unrivalled familiarity with the appearance of each object in the collection gives to his *catalogue raisonné* an authority as yet not seriously challenged. During the century that has passed since this paper of 1811 was written the spectroscope has divided the nebulæ into gaseous and apparently non-gaseous categories ; photography has given us nebula pictures of wonderful beauty, marvellous intricacy of form. Lord Rosse's discovery of the spiral form of a few nebulæ has been followed by the striking, though not yet fully substantiated, proposition that the greater part of the nebulæ are spirals. Barnard's exquisite pictures of the Milky Way have revealed to us the importance of the star clouds and the vast extent of the milky light in the regions affected with nebulosity. Yet there is no modern work whatever that has any pretensions to rival Herschel's careful classification and discussion in his paper of 1811. The fact is so remarkable that we must venture on a short examination of its cause.

Our theory, which may appear at first sight paradoxical, is this : The trouble is due to the ' General Catalogue of Nebulæ,' published by Sir John Herschel in 1864, and to the more modern ' New General Catalogue of Nebulæ and Clusters of Stars,' published in 1890 by the distinguished astronomer and scholar who has edited the Collected Papers. We shall not be suspected of wishing to minimise the value of the second indispensable work, the most widely used of all the publications of the Royal Astronomical Society. But we believe that this catalogue has had an unforeseen and unfortunate effect. In it every nebula known up to the end of the year 1887 is given a single line, a number, a position, and a shorthand description. Since its publication we have remarked a strong tendency to suppose that when you have allowed a nebula to have an N.G.C. number and a place in the sky, you have done everything for it that may reasonably be expected. First there comes the nebula cartographer who works on the principle : one nebula, one spot on the chart. Later there comes the wielder of modern statistical apparatus, who says in effect : Here is a jolly lot of figures very nicely arranged to save us the trouble of any enquiry into their meaning ; let us analyse them into half a

dozen orders of spherical harmonics, and we shall discover laws of nature which would never have been visible to the old-fashioned cartographer, and how much less to a man like Herschel who worried himself with the individuality of each object as if it had a character and personality of its own.

There is a real danger that these modern statistical enquirers may, as Artemus Ward puts it, 'throw so much darkness on 'the subject that we shall soon know nothing about the 'early Saxons,' or other subjects of enquiry. A pioneer of modern statistics has proved that all the skulls of a certain Egyptian collection belonged to a single race of people; the anatomist replies pathetically: I cannot understand your mathematics, but if you look at the skulls you can *see* that they belong to two distinct races. The mathematician constructs an expression to represent the relief of the Earth's surface; the geomorphologist is respectfully doubtful about the propriety of squeezing new mountain ranges and old ocean beds into a single formula.

In all such enquiries there is need for a personal critical faculty which is beyond the realm of statistics. The scenery and construction of the heavens are as characteristic, as locally complex and significant, as the scenery and the condition of diverse regions of the Earth. For a century past astronomy has had specialists who have developed their own special branches of enquiry to an extraordinary degree, but the man has not yet appeared who can write a natural history of the sky as Herschel did for his time.

A. R. Hinks.

THE FIRST OF THE FENIANS

1. **The Autobiography of Wolfe Tone.** New Edition. Edited, with an introduction, by BARRY O'BRIEN. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
2. **The Life of Theobald Wolfe Tone.** By HIMSELF. Washington. 1826.
3. **Studies in Irish History and Biography.** By C. L. FALKINER. Longmans, Green and Co. 1902.
4. **The History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.** By W. E. H. LECKY. Longmans, Green and Co. 1892.
5. **Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland.** By W. E. H. LECKY. Longmans, Green and Co. 1871.
6. **The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.** By J. A. FROUDE. Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.
7. **The United Irishmen.** By R. R. MADDEN. James Duffy, Dublin. 1846.
8. **The Cornwallis Correspondence.** John Murray. 1859.
9. **Howell's State Trials.**

A PECULIAR interest always attaches to the autobiographical in literature, more especially when it takes the form of a private journal written without any view to publication, and only destined for the edification of a small circle of intimates. The autobiographer, as Sir Leslie Stephen once pointed out, has *ex officio* two qualifications of supreme importance in all literary work: he is writing about a topic in which he is keenly interested, and on which he is the highest living authority. After reading the unwieldy volumes which the son of Theobald Wolfe Tone compiled from the vast mass of his father's personal memoranda and literary remains, it is not difficult to understand why the Duke of Wellington should have declared to Samuel Rogers that he had seldom found any book so fascinating as the diary of his brilliant but unfortunate fellow-countryman. Not only do Tone's journals supply a complete and graphic picture of the stirring times in which he lived; they also provide a minute and vivid portrait of their author, forming a fragment of ruthless self-revelation, in which the soul of the man is laid bare with an almost painful lack of self-consciousness and with a degree of candour that could never have been attained by any outside biographer.

The various writers who have attempted to deal impartially with that very difficult period of Irish history which marks the close of the eighteenth century, have but seldom found it possible to divest their minds of the political or religious prejudice which such an epoch seems inevitably to inspire. The portraits of the figures that then flitted across the stage are all coloured by the favour or antipathy with which the painter regarded the cause for which these men laboured; characters are blackened or whitewashed to suit some particular line of argument or point some special moral. For an Englishman to write the history of Ireland without prejudice, as Mr. Herbert Paul somewhere observes, he must be either a cosmopolitan philosopher or a passionless recluse; while only the most superficial veneer of impartiality conceals the partisan advocacy of the average Irish historian.

Wolfe Tone, in common with most of his more prominent contemporaries, has suffered much at the hands of critics and apologists alike. By the former he is commonly described as a traitor, a charlatan, a profligate; in the eyes of the latter he shines forth in the guise of patriot, genius and martyr. Such a writer as Froude, frankly intolerant of the Irish lack of appreciation of England's presumably beneficent tyranny, recognises in the founder of the United Irishmen a misguided rebel, disfigured by the vanity, recklessness and selfish personal ambition which are the invariable characteristics of those 'volunteer politicians' whom he castigates so mercilessly. The Duke of Argyll, again, cannot resist using Tone—whom he plainspokenly dubs 'an unprincipled and unscrupulous 'adventurer'—as a convenient peg whereon to hang arguments against granting Home Rule to a country whose misfortunes he considers to be due rather to the congenital weaknesses of the Irish race than to the past misgovernment of England. Irish biographers of the type of Madden, on the other hand, can find no compliments too fulsome to pay their hero, carefully slurring over Tone's very obvious failings, and investing him with all the attributes of a saint, though he would have been the last man in the world to lay claim to any. It is only, therefore, by reading the ingenuous account of himself which Tone prepared for his wife and children—'for my 'dearest love and my little babies for whom alone I write these 'memorandums'—that we can obtain a definite and just

impression of the man, and gain some insight into his complex but lovable character.

Only at critical moments, says Froude, when some patent wrong has to be redressed, will the better kind of men leave their proper occupations to meddle with politics. It is, however, extremely doubtful if Tone's determination to renounce his profession and meddle with politics was originally inspired by any idea of redressing his country's indisputable wrongs. His early motives were indeed frankly personal and selfish; for the first seven-and-twenty years of his life he seems to have remained completely indifferent to the sufferings of his countrymen, and when at last he set himself the task of winning the independence of his fatherland he was prompted as much by hatred of England as by love of Ireland.

In 1787, at the age of twenty-four, he had gone to London, in accordance with the wishes of his father, a Dublin coach-builder, to read for the Bar. But he was naturally an idler, his heart was not in his work, and after two years of perfunctory study at the Middle Temple he tells us that he knew 'as much 'about law as he did about necromancy,' and he had proved himself to be as obviously unfitted as he was disinclined for a legal career. As a young man the profession of arms had always appealed to him; he loved to watch soldiers drilling in the barrack square, and in imagination would often picture himself in a smart military uniform, attracting the attention of the fair sex with his laced coat and clanking spurs.

If the term 'adventurer' implies a man who has a passion for adventure, Tone certainly deserves the title by which he has so often been styled. He never tired of reading about the doings of explorers, of travellers, of buccaneers and pirates, and at one time entertained serious thoughts of enlisting in the service of the East India Company, which indeed he would have done had not his application been made too late, after the last shipload of recruits had left for the East. In the course of his desultory studies in London he found time to plan an elaborate scheme for establishing a colony, on military lines, in one of the South Sea Islands, which had lately been discovered by Captain Cook. This project he duly set forth in a memorial which he addressed to Pitt, delivering it in person at that statesman's door, and waiting hopefully but vainly for the Minister's reply. Two years later, when he had returned to

Dublin to practise at the Bar, Tone confided his pet colonial plan to his friend Thomas Russell, a young British officer whose acquaintance he had made in the gallery of the House of Commons. Between them they drafted a second scheme of a similar nature for colonising one of the Sandwich Islands, and despatched it to Grenville, who merely sent a formal acknowledgment and then probably never gave the matter another thought. Pitt's neglect had provoked the active resentment of Tone. He writes in his journal: 'In my 'anger I made something like a vow that if ever I had an 'opportunity I would make Mr. Pitt sorry.' The inaction of Grenville served to strengthen and confirm his dislike of those in authority in England.

In 1785, at the early age of two-and-twenty, Tone had eloped with a girl of sixteen, Matilda Witherington—'as beautiful 'as an angel,' he describes her. The elopement was naturally resented by the lady's family; but three years later, on his return to Dublin, Tone became reconciled with his wife's grandfather, in whose house she had resided prior to her marriage, with the result that the old gentleman assisted the young couple financially and enabled Tone to be called to the Irish Bar in 1790. This year proved to be the turning point of his life. It was then that he made what he calls the 'great 'discovery'—though he admits that he might have found it long ago in the writings of Swift or Molyneux—'that the 'influence of England was the radical vice of our Govern-'ment, and consequently that Ireland would never be free, 'prosperous, or happy, until she was independent, and that 'independence was unattainable whilst the connexion with 'England existed.'

While studying at the Temple he had acquired a certain literary facility by contributing articles and book reviews to some of the minor London magazines. A burlesque novel entitled 'Beaumont Castle,' written in collaboration with two or three fellow-students, showed him to possess satirical powers which proved useful in the composition of those political pamphlets which he now began to publish. One of these attracted the notice of George Ponsonby, who caused its author to be elected to the Northern Whig Club, and sought to attach him to the Whig cause by an offer of legal employment which brought the young barrister a welcome sum of eighty guineas. Tone,

however, was not naturally in sympathy with the Whigs, whom he contemptuously described as 'an aristocracy affecting 'the language of patriotism.' In another pamphlet written at this time he expressed views far in advance of any that Ponsonby or Grattan dreamt of holding, and argued that Ireland should not deem herself to be bound by England's declaration of war with a foreign Power. His Whig patrons thereupon ceased to give him further encouragement.

In 1791 he published 'An Argument on behalf of the Catholics 'of Ireland,' in which he embraced the cause of Catholic enfranchisement, and was at once elected a member of the first Company of Belfast Volunteers. With his friend Russell he visited Belfast in October of that year, and found that city already preparing to celebrate, in the following July, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, with all due solemnity. At the instigation of his companion, he proceeded to sketch an outline of policy suitable for such a celebration. Upon this manifesto was founded the famous Society of United Irishmen, an organisation which ultimately caused the loss of 60,000 lives, including that of its originator and founder.

The ostensible aims of the society, as set forth in its organ, the 'Northern Star' of Belfast, were admirably patriotic and altruistic. They were directed towards securing the equal representation in Parliament of all the Irish people, establishing a national brotherhood, based upon common rights and identical interests, and sweeping away the religious and political barriers which prevented Irishmen from fighting shoulder to shoulder in the great cause of liberty. The country was ripe for a struggle for freedom, and Tone's hope of establishing a community of interest between the various creeds and parties—Protestants, Dissenters, Roman Catholics, Whigs and Nationalists—all of whom had their own private grievances to stir them to action, did not appear to be an altogether idle dream. To unite in one bond of national feeling peoples so long alienated from one another was indeed a noble ambition, but one not easy to fulfil.

There is no need to dwell at length upon the distressful condition to which Ireland had by this time sunk, or to trace the successive stages of that degradation to which the industrial jealousy of England so largely contributed. In the days of Charles II. Ireland's chief source of wealth lay, first of all in

her cattle, and afterwards in the sheep and wool in which she did a thriving export trade. Owing, however, to the complaints of English merchants and farmers who dreaded the successful competition of so near a rival, regulations were passed forbidding the exportation of Irish cattle or wool, not only into England and the English dominions, but even into any foreign country. As a natural consequence of such selfish legislation Irish industries dwindled and died, smuggling was the only trade that flourished, and thousands of ruined Irishmen were compelled to emigrate to America. The peasantry were reduced to the lowest depths of misery, going about in rags, lodging with pigs in ramshackle hovels for which they paid exorbitant rents to absentee landlords, who cared nothing for, and knew still less of, their welfare, and being used (as Lord Chesterfield said) 'worse than negroes by their 'lords and masters and their deputies of deputies of deputies.'

Commercial grievances were common to Irishmen of all creeds and denominations, but the sufferings of the Roman Catholics were especially enhanced by the religious intolerance of a peculiarly bigoted age. The Penal Code excluded Catholics from any responsible or lucrative post, from Bench or Bar, from the magistracy, from corporations and universities. It forbade them to serve on juries—no great hardship, we may assume, but a source of irritation nevertheless—to enlist in either army or navy, or to adopt the profession of solicitor, schoolmaster, tutor or watchman ; and denied them the right to vote. By its provisions Catholics were prevented from buying or inheriting land, or accepting it as a gift from Protestants, and they might not hold any lease of more than thirty-one years' duration. They were not allowed to employ more than two apprentices or to possess a horse valued at more than £5 ; furthermore, a Protestant was at any time entitled to take a Catholic's horse on payment of £5. Many degrading conditions were attached to their testamentary powers, and the Penal Code was, indeed, as Burke sarcastically described it, 'a machine of wise and 'elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, 'impoverishment and degradation of a people, and the debase-'ment in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from 'the perverted ingenuity of man.' The Catholic peasantry, besides maintaining their own priests and high-schools, paid tithes to clergy who took no interest in their souls, and helped to

support those Protestant bishops whom Swift satirised by assuming that they were admirable persons when they left London but had unfortunately been murdered on Hounslow Heath by highwaymen who afterwards impersonated their victims.

In Tone's day when, as Lord Beaconsfield declared, to govern Ireland was only to apportion the public plunder to a corrupt senate, the Irish Government was quite unequal to the task of preserving order. The legislature and the aristocracy were utterly corrupt. The gentry, as Froude admits, had neglected their duties so long that they had forgotten they had any duties to perform, and the hopelessly miserable peasantry, 'finding 'the law a sword in the hands of their oppressors,' looked to crime and rebellion as the sole means of self-defence. If only they could have been persuaded to combine, there is little doubt that the oppressed Irish might ultimately have achieved that independence which was ever the goal of Tone and his society; for of the fifteen million inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland some four and a half million were Irish—a larger number than the United States could muster when they won their freedom at the point of the sword.

Tone enjoyed unique opportunities of gaining the confidence of men of all creeds, for though by birth a Protestant, he had, in 1792, succeeded the vain and inept Richard Burke as Secretary of the Catholic Committee. He was therefore the very man to carry out his favourite project of combining Catholics and Protestants in that common hostility to England and English rule which should eventually lead to liberty.

'To subvert the tyranny of our execrable government (he writes), to break the connexion with England, the unfailing source of all our political evils, and to assert the independence of my country—these were my objects. To unite the people of Ireland, to abolish the memory of all past divisions, and to substitute the common cause of Irishmen in place of the denominations of Protestant, Catholic and Dissenter—these were my means.'

But the task to which he devoted himself was not an easy one. The Protestants already possessed the whole power and prestige of the country, and though eager enough for parliamentary reform, were not particularly anxious to share their political privileges with the Catholics. The latter, again, earnestly desired emancipation and enfranchisement, but were

indifferent upon the question of parliamentary reform, realising that whatever changes might be made in the system it would always remain Protestant. Tone appreciated the feelings of both parties, and recognised that it was as useless to preach to the Protestants as it was unnecessary to attempt to proselytise the already converted Catholics. He turned therefore to the Dissenters (to whom he had already addressed his 'Argument on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland'), in the hope of making them realise that they and the Catholics had in England a common enemy and in independence a common panacea.

Fortune did not favour Tone's intrigues. In 1793 the penal laws directed against Catholics were withdrawn, and the latter, though still denied the right to vote, were thus deprived of the grievances upon which nationalist agitators relied as the chief incentive to popular rebellion. In the following year Tone became involved in the notorious Jackson case and found his fatherland too hot to hold him.

Jackson was a Protestant clergyman whom the French Directory had employed to discover what chance of success a French invading force would have in Ireland and what sort of reception it might expect to receive from the Irish. He came over to London in 1794, and thence crossed to Dublin, accompanied by Cockayne, the Duchess of Kingston's attorney, who pretended to be his friend, though in reality he was in the pay of the English Government and kept Pitt informed of his companion's movements. Tone was anxious to meet Jackson, and had already drawn up a paper which he proposed laying before the Directory, showing the state of the parties in Ireland, the numerical strength of the Catholics and Dissenters, and emphasising the certainty of success if France would assist them in overthrowing the government. He attended a breakfast party given by Hamilton Rowan in his prison cell in Dublin, at which the only other guests were Jackson and Cockayne. He had previously shown his paper to Rowan, who copied it and gave the copy to Jackson to post to a correspondent in Hamburg. Jackson in turn handed the letter to Cockayne, and the latter informed the police and allowed himself to be arrested with the incriminating document upon him. Jackson was tried and condemned to death, Rowan escaped from gaol and fled in an open boat to France and thence to America, and

though the evidence was not considered sufficient to convict Tone, he was advised to seek some climate healthier than that of his native land, and discreetly promised to cross the Atlantic as soon as he had put his affairs in order.

In 1795, then, with his wife and family, Tone set forth for Philadelphia on board the 'Cincinnatus,' a boat of some 230 tons, but had scarcely arrived in sight of the American port before the vessel was boarded by a cutter from an English man-of-war in search of recruits. The entire crew of the helpless 'Cincinnatus' was impressed to serve as British sailors, as were also some fifty of her 300 passengers, including Tone, who only obtained his release with the greatest difficulty and chiefly owing to the earnest solicitations of his youthful and pretty wife.

For a time at least he seems now to have turned his mind away from the practice of that political intrigue in which he delighted, and entertained serious thoughts of residing peaceably and quietly in America on a little farm which he bought in the neighbourhood of Princeton, New Jersey. But before leaving home he had often discussed with his friends Russell and Emmet a scheme for personally persuading the French Republic to come to the aid of Ireland. In America he met Rowan and Napper Tandy, who introduced him to M. Adet, the French resident Minister. He also received letters from Keogh and other United Irishmen assuring him that their country was ripe for independence. The temptation was too strong, and he determined to set out at once for France.

On the 2nd of February 1796 he arrived at Havre, and hastened direct to Paris. He had provided himself with a letter of introduction to De La Croix, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, whom he found dressed in a grey silk dressing-gown over a kind of scarlet cassock of satin, with rose-coloured silk stockings and scarlet ribbons in his shoes. While noting the costume he explained his errand, reported the condition of Ireland, optimistically declared that half the seamen and soldiers in the British navy and army were Irish and would refuse to fight against their fellow-countrymen, and finally suggested that a French expeditionary force of 20,000 men should be sent to Ireland without delay. Next, acting on the advice of Monroe, the American Minister in Paris, Tone demanded and was granted an audience with the great

Carnot himself. The Organiser of Victory received him kindly but without much enthusiasm. The head of the Republic, like his Foreign Minister, was attired in a most undemocratic costume of white satin covered by a crimson robe, richly embroidered, 'all very elegant, and exactly resembling the 'draperies of Vandyke.' Tone once again propounded his scheme for a French invasion, was listened to politely, and retired. 'I am like Hannibal at the Court of Prusius,' he comments in his diary, 'supplicating his aid to enable Carthage 'to make war upon the Romans.'

Later on he was again summoned to meet the Director and his military advisers, and repaired to the Palace of Luxembourg, where he was shown into a splendid apartment and bidden to await the advent of his host. Carnot arrived shortly afterwards, accompanied by his Secretary of War, General Clarke (afterwards Duc de Feltre), and the great General Hoche, who had recently been holding secret meetings with Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Arthur O'Connor on the Swiss border, and had thus enjoyed an opportunity of comparing their account of Irish affairs with that given by Tone. After bowing coldly to their visitor the distinguished trio left the room in silence. Tone waited for six hours, from 8 P.M. until 2 A.M., somewhat surprised at this curious treatment, and at last, just as his patience was becoming exhausted and he was looking about for a means of escape, the generals and their chief reappeared. Clarke advanced and shook the Irishman warmly by the hand: 'Citizen, I congratulate you,' he exclaimed. 'We go to Ireland!' General Hoche, too, hastened to add his congratulations to those of his colleague, and Carnot's attitude was now as friendly as it had been chilly six hours earlier.

A brief experience of French official methods showed Tone that the organisation of his long-planned expedition would be a lengthy affair, so he wrote to his wife in America bidding her to rejoin him. The ship that bore his letter was seized by an English man-of-war and carried into Plymouth, and though he was conspiring to effect the destruction of England, with an amazing lack of logic Tone made this interception of his correspondence a fresh grievance against that country. 'Well, 'this is the second time in my life I am indebted for a serious 'evil to Master John Bull. He hunted me out of my country 'first, and now he is preventing me bringing my family to

'France; and does he think I will forget that? No! I won't, 'no more than his attempt to press me for a sailor on my 'passage out to America.'

It is not too much to say that Tone's position in Paris at this time was unique. When he arrived in France his knowledge of the French language was of the haziest description; he was without friends, influence, or money. Yet by sheer strength of character he was able to win the confidence of the leading Frenchmen of the day, who were not too proud to seek the advice and listen to the capable suggestions of this youthful foreign adventurer. 'Yesterday I dined with Carnot (President 'of the Executive Directory of France),' he notes in his journal, 'and to-day I should be puzzled to raise a guinea!'

It was his buoyancy and self-confidence that chiefly contributed to his success, and these are the dominant notes throughout the pages of his journal.

'To-day is my birthday' [he writes on the 20th of June 1796], 'I am thirty-three years old. At that age Alexander had conquered the world; at that age Wolfe had completed his reputation, and expired in the arms of victory. Well, it is not my fault if I am not as great a man as Alexander or Wolfe. I have as good dispositions for glory as either of them, but I labour under two small obstacles at least—want of talents and want of opportunities; neither of which, I confess, I can help. *Allons! nous verrons!* If I succeed here I may make some noise in the world yet; and, what is better, the cause to which I am devoted is so just that I have not one circumstance to reproach myself with. I will endeavour to keep myself as pure as I can, as to the means; as to the end, it is sacred—the liberty and independence of my country first, the establishment of my wife and of our darling babies next; and last, I hope, a well-earned reputation.'

During the next few months, devoted to the necessary preparations for the projected French invasion of Ireland, Tone had need of all the patience and optimism that he could command. He had by this time been appointed Chef de Brigade in the service of the Republic—a post more honourable than lucrative, since the monthly pay only amounted to £3. 2. 6—and spent his time in stimulating the dilatory authorities to action. In his anxiety to promote the success of the expedition he even condescended to perform the duties of recruiting-sergeant, visiting the British prisoners of war at Pontanezen, near Brest, and offering their liberty to as many as were willing

to serve aboard the French fleet. (It is interesting to note that of the sixty Irish prisoners whom he thus approached, Tone succeeded in persuading no fewer than fifty to enlist under the flag of the Republic, but of the hundred English prisoners he could only pervert the patriotism of ten, and was unable to seduce a single Scotsman.)

At the beginning of December General Hoche's expedition, consisting of seventeen ships of the line, eleven frigates and corvettes, and fifteen transports, having on board some fifteen thousand soldiers and a plentiful supply of guns and spare weapons for the Irish rebels, was ready to start from Brest. Between that port and Ushant lay an English squadron, and in the hope of diverting attention from the principal objective of the expedition a force of eleven hundred men of the Légion Noire, under the command of an American officer, Colonel Tate by name, sailed away to Bristol with orders to burn that city. These got no further than Milford, however, where they landed and were at once ignominiously taken prisoners. Meanwhile, although a steady east wind was blowing daily and everything seemed favourable to the expedition, delays had occurred which postponed General Hoche's departure for a precious fortnight, and it was not until the 16th of December that the fleet at last got under way and sailed out of Brest harbour in the direction of Ireland. Hoche himself was on board the 'Fraternité,' Grouchy (the officer second in command) was on the 'Immortalité,' and Tone on the 'Indomptable.'

Ill luck seems to have pursued the expedition from the very start. For some unaccountable reason the vessels lost touch with one another almost as soon as they reached the open sea, and on the 20th of December when the wind suddenly veered round to the west, half the fleet, including the all-important 'Fraternité,' was nowhere to be seen. On the following day an east wind once more arose, but in the meanwhile, of the forty-three vessels which had left Brest a week before seventeen had been blown out of their course, and the remainder, having succeeded in entering Bantry Bay, anchored off Bere Island, and waited in vain for reinforcements and for the arrival of their leader. In the absence of Hoche—whose ship had been lost in a fog and was already on its way back to Rochelle—the command of the expedition devolved upon Grouchy, but he hesitated to accept the responsibility of taking action until it was too late

to act. It was the same General Grouchy to whose dilatory methods Napoleon was later to attribute his defeat at Waterloo.

On the 23rd of December the wind developed into a gale, the air was thick with snow, and the cold was piercing. The storm raged more furiously every moment, and an attempt to land six or seven thousand soldiers behind Whiddy Island failed. For six whole days the French fleet remained unmolested in Bantry Bay, without a sign of an English man-of-war to withstand them, and only the elements to fight against. On the 27th of December the tempest reached such a height that the anchors dragged and one after another the French ships were blown out to sea. Eight of them managed for a while to keep together, and contemplated a descent upon the west coast of Clare, but the fury of the sea proved too much for them, and they were reluctantly compelled to sail back to Brest with their mission unaccomplished.

'England has not had such an escape since the Spanish 'Armada,' is Tone's record in his journal, 'and that expedi-'tion, like ours, was defeated by the weather.' That Tone was not alone in holding this view may be gathered from a letter written by the Viceroy, Lord Camden, to the Duke of Portland on the same subject: 'We have had an escape,' he says, 'which, on account of the impression which it has made, I wish 'had not been owing so entirely to the winds.'

After the complete failure of Hoche's expedition the French interest in Tone's project for an Irish invasion momentarily declined. But the Republic did not lose sight of it altogether, and delegated the task to their Dutch allies, who were quite ready to undertake it. In July 1797, therefore, the Dutch Admiral De Winter lay in the Texel with a fleet of sixteen sail of the line, ten frigates, and twenty-seven transports, on board of which was a force of 15,000 men under General Dandaels. De Winter only awaited a favourable opportunity to sail out into the open sea and engage the smaller English fleet under Admiral Duncan which was watching the mouth of the Texel. Once again, however, the winds—'the only unsubsidised 'allies of England,' as they have been called—destroyed the chances of England's enemies. In the face of a continuous westerly gale the Dutch fleet found it impossible to leave the harbour.

Even the sanguine Tone, who was occupying a place of

honour on board De Winter's flagship, began to despair of success. His irritation increased daily, and he found it hard to possess his soul in patience. Like that other more famous swashbuckling genius and autobiographer, Benvenuto Cellini, he had a pretty talent for playing the flute—surely the most innocent of domestic accomplishments ever possessed by such an arch-conspirator !—and as the Dutch admiral, like Pinero's 'Cabinet Minister,' was also a performer upon this instrument, the two sought to keep up their spirits and while away the time with shrill duets. But it was all in vain that they whistled for a favourable breeze ; the adverse wind continued to blow, and the expedition had to be postponed from month to month until, in October, when De Winter at length set sail, Duncan was strong enough to destroy and scatter the Dutch fleet at Camperdown and with it all hopes of invasion.

Soon after this event General Hoche died of consumption, and poor Tone saw the realisation of his dreams fading further and further into the distance. He would not, however, altogether give up hope, and once again began his self-imposed task of inciting the French authorities to action and attempting to infect them with some of his own unbounded enthusiasm for the cause he had at heart. With this object in view he managed to obtain an introduction to Napoleon, whom he visited at his residence in the Rue de Chantereine, where the great man lived in extreme simplicity, 'his house small but neat, and all the 'furniture and ornaments in the most classical taste.'

Tone has left an interesting record of his impressions of Napoleon, whom he describes as short of stature, slender and well-made, but with stooping shoulders. 'His face,' he says, 'is that of a profound thinker, but bears no marks of that great 'enthusiasm and unceasing activity by which he has been so 'much distinguished. It is rather, to my mind, the countenance 'of a mathematician than a general.' Much to his visitor's disappointment Napoleon, unlike Hoche, whom he had succeeded as director of the French foreign military policy, took little or no interest in the affairs of Ireland. His mind was fixed upon larger issues than those involved in Tone's scheme ; he was already dreaming of that Empire in the East beside which all other projects paled into insignificance ; to him the question of invading Ireland seemed a matter of trivial importance. Las Cases, in his *Mémoires de Saint Hélène*, declares that Bona-

parte lived to regret his indifference and realised when it was too late what a blow he might have struck at England by attacking her upon her most vulnerable side, with Ireland as a base. 'On what do the destinies of empires hang?' the ex-Emperor is quoted as saying. 'If instead of the expedition 'to Egypt, I had made one to Ireland; if slight diverging 'circumstances had not thrown obstacles in the way of my 'Boulogne enterprise; what would England have been to-day? 'and the Continent? and the political world?'

But though Napoleon remained indifferent to Tone's arguments, news of the Irish rising of 1798 proved more eloquent and effective than any personal appeal, and inclined the French Directory to reconsider the question of sending to the assistance of the rebels. General Humbert was ordered to organise a force at Rochelle, General Hardy raised a slightly larger body of troops at Brest, and towards the end of the summer the two expeditions sailed away to Ireland from their respective posts.

On the 22nd of August Humbert landed at Killala, on the west coast of Mayo, where he successfully surprised and defeated the Government troops under General Lake. After this victory the French general naturally supposed that the Irish patriots in whose cause he was fighting would flock to his side. In this, however, he was disappointed, for Irish Catholics were unable to join whole-heartedly with an atheist Republic whose recent barbarous treatment of its priests showed such hostility towards the Church of Rome. Seventeen days after landing Humbert found himself surrounded by a superior force at Ballinamuck and was compelled to surrender. A month later General Hardy, on board the 'Hoche,' with eight frigates and a force of 3,000 men, arrived off the Irish coast. As usual, the elements conspired to favour England, the French ships were scattered by a storm, and on the 10th of October the 'Hoche,' the 'Biche,' and two other frigates became separated from the rest of the fleet and reached the mouth of the Swilly, with Sir John Warren, the English admiral, in hot pursuit.

Wolfe Tone was on board the 'Hoche,' which was soon surrounded by four English vessels, each as large as herself. But though the issue of the fight was obvious from the first, Tone resolutely declined to avail himself of an opportunity to escape. At the last moment a boat from the 'Biche' came alongside for final orders, and the French officers on board the 'Hoche'

implored Tone to leave the flagship before it was too late. 'Our contest is hopeless,' they said. 'We shall be prisoners 'of war; but what will become of you?' 'Shall it be said 'that I fled whilst the French were fighting the battles of my 'country?' he asked indignantly, as he took his place at the head of one of the ship's batteries.

For six hours the gallant 'Hoche' sustained the fire of the whole English fleet. Her masts and rigging were swept away, her scuppers flowed with blood, her wounded filled the cockpit; the batteries were silenced one by one, every single gun was dismounted, and at last, when his vessel lay a battered and dismantled wreck on the waters, the French admiral reluctantly struck his flag.* The crew of the 'Hoche' were taken on shore, and, in accordance with the time-honoured traditions of courtesy obtaining between combatants, the vanquished officers were invited to breakfast by the Earl of Cavan, who commanded the district. Tone, in his French military uniform, passed unnoticed among his brother-officers, and would perhaps have remained unrecognised but for Sir George Hill, a leader of the Orange party, who had been his fellow-student at Trinity College, Dublin. Accompanied by a number of police officers Hill entered the breakfast-room and walked across to where his old acquaintance was sitting. 'Mr. Tone,' he said meaningly, 'I am very happy to see you.' 'Sir George Hill,' replied Tone, without expressing any emotion, 'I am happy to see you; how 'are Lady Hill and your family?' He was then seized by the police. As they prepared to handcuff him he threw off his uniform coat: 'These fetters shall never degrade the revered 'insignia of the free nation which I have served!' he exclaimed dramatically. And as the heavy irons were fastened to his wrists and ankles, 'For the cause which I have embraced,' he declared, 'I feel prouder to wear these chains than if I were 'decorated with the star and garter of England!'

It is when Tone indulges in heroics of this description that we recognise that theatrical side of his nature which critics have hitherto failed to take into consideration, but which

---

* It is of interest to note that the 'Hoche' in which Tone fought so gallantly was after capture renamed the 'Donegal,' and carried Arthur Wellesley (another Irishman) to the scene of his future triumphs in the Spanish Peninsula.

nevertheless supplies a key to much of his character. As a youth he had been an enthusiastic amateur actor, often taking part in those private theatricals which delight the performers almost as much as they weary the patient audience. The pages of his diary are punctuated with tags and quotations from numerous old plays in which he had faced the footlights. Like many professional mummers, he had come unconsciously to ignore the line dividing the drama from real life, and in his everyday existence would often express himself in terms of the theatre and adopt a histrionic attitude which he deemed becoming to the rôle he had chosen. His love of intrigue was fostered by a keen dramatic sense which enabled him to picture himself playing the interesting part of the conspirator of melodrama, throwing his long black cloak about him, drawing his soft felt hat over his eyes, and whispering 'But hush! 'we are observed!' or scowling—as we find him doing each time his plans are foiled—'Ha! ha! A time will come!' He was by nature intensely emotional; his spirits rose and fell rapidly, his mood would be buoyant and melancholy in turns, and the tears came to his eyes on the slightest provocation. Indeed, in Paris he seems to have been always weeping. When the mob shouted to see an ensign pass with the tricolor flag, 'Here was no fiction!' he exclaims in his journal, 'and 'that it was that drew the tears irresistibly into my eyes!' He frequently found himself crying when he watched the French troops passing his window, and 'when Carnot presented the 'wreaths and standards to the soldiers' the tears coursed down his cheeks. Nevertheless, underlying his pretentious theatrical pose and his lachrymose sentimentality lay an earnest and very real devotion to an unselfish cause, extraordinary personal courage, and an admirable spirit of self-sacrificing patriotism. When patriotism is genuine, as Froude says, it confers on the most misguided enthusiast a certain nobility of temperament. It may stifle conscience and destroy scruple, but in the enthusiast it creates a readiness to sacrifice fortune, life, even reputation itself, to the cause which he has embraced; and in the case of Tone the sacrifice was willingly and even cheerfully made.

He was taken to Dublin in chains, and there confined in the military prison. By strict law he should have been brought before the King's Bench, but the fact that he held a commission

in the French army gave the authorities an excuse for trying him by court-martial, though if carried to its logical conclusion this argument should have rendered him altogether immune from trial. He appeared in court arrayed in full French uniform, and when called upon to plead, 'Guilty!' he cried, true to the old theatrical instinct which seldom wholly deserted him, 'for 'I have never during my life stooped to a prevarication!'

Throughout his trial Tone maintained a calm and dignified demeanour which impressed, if it could not influence, his judges. In his defence he had carefully prepared a lengthy paper, much of which the President of the Court rightly adjudged irrelevant, and suppressed. Part of the apology which he was not allowed to read was devoted to paying a graceful tribute of thanks to the Catholics who had stood by him in his misfortune.

'I have laboured to create a people in Ireland, by raising three millions of my countrymen to the rank of citizens. I have laboured to abolish the infernal spirit of religious persecution by uniting the Catholics and Dissenters. To the former I owe more than can ever be repaid; the services I was so fortunate as to render them they rewarded munificently; but they did more: when the public cry was raised against me, when the friends of my youth swarmed off and left me alone, the Catholics did not desert me—they had the virtue even to sacrifice their own interests to a rigid principle of honour; they refused, though strongly urged, to disgrace a man who, whatever his conduct towards the Government might have been, had faithfully and conscientiously discharged his duty towards them, and in so doing, though it was in my own case, I will say they showed an instance of public virtue and honour of which I know not whether there exists another example.'

All this, and much more to the same effect, was quite beside the point, as the President politely explained. Tone indeed had no plausible plea to urge in his defence; he had admitted his guilt, the Court could but find him guilty, and impose the only possible punishment—death. The prisoner heard the sentence unmoved. 'I have forfeited my life,' he admitted. 'The 'Court will do its duty. I shall not be wanting in mine;' and merely begged that he might be accorded the privilege of suffering the honourable death of a soldier. This was refused him, illogically enough, and he was condemned to be hanged like a common felon. He, however, anticipated the fulfilment of the sentence by cutting his throat in prison on the evening before the day fixed for his execution.

A few weeks earlier, with the other Irishmen who took part in Hardy's expedition, he had discussed the permissibility of committing suicide rather than fall into the hands of the English, and had stoutly maintained that to adopt such a course, and thus deprive their enemies of the shame of murdering them, would be unjustifiable. But in the shadow of the scaffold Tone changed his mind and felt no scruples in availing himself of that 'sharp antidote against disgrace,' as suicide is termed by Edmund Burke. His attempt at self-destruction, like that of Haydon and many another man before and since his day, was not immediately successful, and he lingered for nearly a week before finding in death a merciful release from pain. 'They say I know everything,' he smilingly remarked to the prison surgeon, referring no doubt to the statement that had been made as to his complete knowledge of the French plans for a descent upon Ireland, 'but you see, doctor, there are some things I do not know. I find I am a bad anatomist!'

Wolfe Tone, as Mr. C. L. Falkiner justly observes, must always be remembered as the first of the Fenians, in spirit and sentiment, if not in name. He was in many ways a typical Irish revolutionist, adventurer and patriot, combining what the poet Moore calls 'a truly Irish mixture of daring 'in design with light-heartedness of execution.' Impetuous, fearless, witty, garrulous, he possessed a wonderful personal charm which made him attractive even to his enemies, and his old friend Plunkett (afterwards Lord Plunkett), bearing testimony in the House of Commons to the greatness of his abilities, declared that he had a heart which nothing but 'the 'accursed spirit of perverted politics' could mislead or pervert. Unscrupulous though he might be about the means of attaining his end, that end—the conversion of what was merely a Protestant colony into an independent nation—was not, from his own point of view, unworthy of the sacrifice he made on its behalf.

HARRY GRAHAM.

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ADMIRAL AND DIPLOMAT

The Life of Edward Mountagu, K.G., First Earl of Sandwich. By F. R. HARRIS. Murray. 2 vols. 8vo. 1912.

EDWARD MOUNTAGU, First Earl of Sandwich, holds a somewhat prominent place in the history of the seventeenth century, due, perhaps, to two incidents which were almost accidents in his career—his share in the Restoration of Charles II., and his death in the battle of Solebay. Apart from these two incidents, the ordinary reader might be puzzled to say what he knows about him. It is not that there was nothing else in his career that was noteworthy, nothing which roused public or party feeling, but either the matters were not of permanent interest, or Mountagu's share in them was obscure. Most people probably know that he was ambassador at Madrid and succeeded in temporarily arranging our relations with Spain; students of naval history have of course known that his action in the battle of Lowestoft has been highly commended, and have speculated on what it was that he did; they have discussed his conduct relative to the Dutch East Indian prizes, although unable to trace the hidden meaning of the outcry; but through all, the Earl of Sandwich has remained a somewhat shadowy personage, burly and good-looking, as appears from Lely's portraits; stolid and good-tempered, as appears from Pepys's Diary; but still a man of whom not very much was to be said.

This overlying mistiness is what the present Earl of Sandwich wished to remove, and, with his countenance and assistance, Mr. Harris has to a great extent removed in the work which we have named above. Foremost, and occupying the chief place in this assistance, must be named the free access which Mr. Harris has had to the Sandwich papers—journals, memoranda and letters—preserved at Hinchingbrooke. To these he has brought ability, interest and a trained capacity for historic work, and the result is that we have a clearer view of the first Earl than ever before. We do not indeed find ourselves always in agreement with Mr. Harris's conclusions, and from time to time we seem to diagnose the 'lues Boswell-

'iana' in a wish to attribute certain incidents in his hero's career to his exceptional talent or qualities, when a more unprejudiced examiner would regard them as the result of other and entirely commonplace causes.

Possibly the first instance of this is also one of the clearest. Edward Mountagu, born on the 27th of July 1625, was just eighteen when he was appointed, by Cromwell's influence, to the command of a regiment—'not,' says Mr. Harris, 'because 'of his birth, for with Cromwell that weighed little—but 'because he saw in him the material out of which leaders are 'fashioned.' Does Mr. Harris really suppose that Mountagu's cousin the Earl of Manchester, his father-in-law John Crew, his brother-in-law Sir Gilbert Pickering, and his life-long friend Oliver Cromwell, were guided not by family ties and affection, but solely by their knowledge of the youngster's merit?

That young Mountagu took the Parliamentary side was unquestionably due to the influence of his kinsmen and friend. He does not seem to have had, at any time, any puritanical notions about religion, and his political principles were always monarchical, though, from personal motives, he may have preferred a Cromwell to a Stuart, as long as a Cromwell was available. Granted that he was fighting for his friends and the principles of his friends, he certainly fought well. His regiment and his name were distinguished at Marston Moor, where, as Mr. Harris tells us, with an originality which we think is entirely his own, 'the Parliamen-'tarians, by their dash and brilliance, earned themselves the 'name of "Ironsides."' 'The brigade of Col. Russell, Col. 'Pickering and Col. Mountagu (none of them, we may notice, 'holding the command by right of birth) stood as a wall of 'Brasse.'

After Marston Moor, Manchester and Cromwell began to draw apart, and Mr. Harris says that to Mountagu, 'full 'of a stubborn enthusiasm, the policy of energy and the 'fighting for freedom made a strong appeal.' This way of looking at the matter is at variance with every estimate we can form of the character of the man, who even as a lad had, according again to Mr. Harris, 'dedicated [to Cromwell] 'a dogged hero-worship.' By the time, he says, that Mountagu 'was upon the threshold of manhood, Cromwell's local power 'was so strong as to appeal to the youth in a way the rigid

'loyalty of his father had never done.' In the New Model it was the same. He fought with dash and spirit, but always for the party of Cromwell.

With the storming of Bristol his army service came to an end. He was returned to the House of Commons, in which he took his seat as bound to Cromwell. His 'devotion to Crom-'well,' says Mr. Harris, 'was beyond question.' This devotion was up to this time indeed the very essence and body of Mountagu's politics. But it was unobtrusive, and Parliament toned down his enthusiasms. The ardour for the Parliamentary cause which he had displayed at eighteen, slowly cooled down at twenty-two; his part in the second Civil War was insignificant; his affection for Cromwell seems to have become more sober; he differed from the views held by the army, and he was excluded from the House when Pride purged it

It is probable, indeed it is entirely consistent with his character, now supported by man's judgment, that, as Mr. Harris says, 'at Hinchingbrooke, he received the news of the 'king's execution with sorrow, doubt and misgiving for the 'future.' And so, leading a strictly private life, and having little intercourse with Cromwell, he continued till July 1653, when he was again called to Parliament, and 'Cromwell, not 'unmindful of old associations, plunged him straight into 'administrative work.' He was made a member of the Council of State, of the Committee for Foreign Affairs, and, in November, Lord President of the Council. As he was not a ready speaker, and as he had been retired from public life and public business for four years, it is quite clear that his principal qualification for high office was his devotion to Cromwell, and his readiness to accept Cromwell's personal government. So he continued till, in the beginning of 1656, he was appointed General at Sea, Commander-in-Chief jointly with Robert Blake.

Such an appointment is curious and significant. Mr. Harris says that Blake had expressed a desire for a colleague, owing to his own ill-health. He gives no authority for the statement, and we know of none that can be considered satisfactory. He says also that the appointment was largely political; we should prefer saying that it was entirely so. There could be no other reason for nominating to a post of such tremendous possibilities a young man, little over thirty years of age, and of but three

years' service as a soldier, who had probably never even seen the sea. Blake had declared his readiness to accept Cromwell's government, but enthusiasm was perhaps not to be expected, and the excuse of his failing health was readily taken to strengthen Cromwell's position. Beyond that, it does not appear that Mountagu did anything, though as an intelligent man, adapting himself to the circumstances, he could and did prepare himself for further command.

He also sent home a report of the possibilities of successfully attacking Gibraltar. It is a soldier's report; and though an attempt in the way he proposed might—probably would—have been successful, it asked for 'four or five thousand men, 'well formed and officered.' Fifty years later the place was taken by seamen, supported by marines, without a single land soldier except the Prince of Hesse-Darmstadt, and, presumably, his staff. Mr. Harris says that it was at this time that 'under Blake and Mountagu, the true significance of the 'Gibraltar defile was first clearly recognised,'—an extraordinary statement, for it is quite clear that the idea of Gibraltar came to the generals from Cromwell, and it may be taken for granted that Cromwell received it from the reports of Wimbledon's expedition of 1625—thirty years before the time of Blake and Mountagu. That even Bruce and Wimbledon were the first to recognise the strategic value of the Straits would be a very rash assertion. Cromwell, however, did not find it possible, or at least convenient just then, to send out troops to seize on the Rock; the proposal was shelved for the time, and for the rest, Mountagu's business with the fleet seems to have mainly been writing the reports and quarrelling with his colleague.

Mr. Harris thinks that this last is incorrect; 'Mountagu's 'letters,' he says, 'do not show traces of any serious disagree-'ment'; nor did he make 'any complaint to Cromwell, 'though the circumstances of his appointment would have 'justified it.' But men shut up for months on board ship may easily be in a very disagreeable humour for the time, without laying any formal complaint afterwards, and Gardiner was of opinion that Mountagu's not returning to the Mediterranean in 1657 was a strong corroboration of the report that the two generals 'were not on good terms during the voyage.' At any rate, Mountagu did go to England in the end of 1656, and did not

return. That he had learnt some of the details of a ship and had had his attention directed to questions of naval tactics and of the strategical power of fleets may be admitted; but Mr. Harris goes quite too far in saying that 'by the time the 'voyage was over, he was in a fair way to become a practised 'seaman.' We doubt even whether it is quite accurate to say that 'during this cruise he absorbed many of the charac-'teristics and expressions of the tarpaulin.'

In the following year Mountagu commanded the fleet in the North Sea, with instructions to render the French what assistance he could, and in that capacity he was present at the reduction of Mardyk and at the battle of the Dunes. Here too Mr. Harris uses very exaggerated language. At both these operations, indeed, the English ships were present; at the battle of the Dunes they were, to some extent, the determining factor, by the threat of their position, though it is uncertain whether they took any active part. But though the duty was done excellently well, there was nothing in it, on either occasion, that can be considered as the crowded hour of glorious life, which could colour the memories of 1657 or 1658.

In the latter year Cromwell died, and the succession of his son Richard met with Mountagu's ready acquiescence. He possibly believed that Richard Cromwell might restore internal peace and unity to the country; but such belief can only have been the child of hope and affection, for he had known Richard from boyhood, and could not but be aware of his political incapacity. But the idea of a monarchy was strong in Mountagu. He had been one of the foremost in urging Oliver to take the title of 'king,' and to him the hereditary protector was king. His principles and his affection for the man agreed in leading him to support Richard, especially against those of the house of Cromwell who, whether from jealousy, pique or principle, chose to call themselves Republicans. The needs of the service, however, called him away. Monck was commanding in Scotland; Penn was virtually shelved; an admiral of the highest rank was wanted to take command of a fleet to the Sound; and Disbrowe was an admiral only in name. Mountagu was the only general available, and he was called on to take the command.

This chapter of Mr. Harris's book is, at present, the best

account which we have of the complicated interests then disturbing the Sound. As regards other countries, these became almost entirely questions of trade, and led the Dutch to favour the Danes while the English supported the Swedes; but neither Dutch nor English wished the control of the Sound to fall absolutely into the hands of either Dane or Swede; and thus the task before them was one of mediation, though mediation that might easily be disturbed by hostilities; for which reason the fleet, under Mountagu, was sent into the northern waters. In the middle of his diplomatic embarrassments came the news of the downfall of Richard Cromwell. Mountagu had been loyal to the memory of Oliver and to the personality of Oliver's son, but he did not feel himself in any way tied to Oliver's brother-in-law or son-in-law, who had together forced Richard's resignation, and were endeavouring to seize the chief power for themselves. To royalist agents he was at once a mark. He needed no agents to convert him to a belief in a monarch as the one remedy for the evils of the time, but he may well have needed agents to prove to his satisfaction that Charles Stuart was the man; and much consideration was necessary to convince him that he himself had any sufficient power.

His authority in the fleet was, in fact, far from absolute. As primarily a soldier, he was not in personal sympathy with the seamen and cannot have had much influence over them. Goodsonn, his vice-admiral, may easily have had much more, but he seems to have been a stolid sort of man, who did his duty excellently, and—as far as is known—left political and constitutional problems to those whom they more immediately concerned. There is no trace of any difference between him and Mountagu. Nor was there any display of political feeling in the fleet, even after Lawson was appointed to the command in succession to Mountagu.

From the first the question, as it appeared to Mountagu, who made no secret of his discontent with the new government, was between the House of Cromwell and the House of Stuart—Cromwell for preference. When he was convinced of the impossibility of re-establishing Richard Cromwell, or of replacing him by Henry, he had to fall back upon the only alternative, the Stuarts — and distinctively Charles. Mr. Harris says that Charles was 'at some pains to find out the

'admiral's real feelings,' and quotes at considerable length a report which the would-be king received from Samuel Morland, dated the 15th of June 1659. In this, Morland, who was exactly Mountagu's age, says that he had been 'acquainted most intimately' with Mountagu 'for at 'least these seven or eight years.'

'He is'—he says—'a person of most ingenious parts and of a very sweete and candid disposition, but with all extreme cautelous, and intimate but with very few. As for his affection he was wholly devoted to old Noll his countryman, and for his sake a great lover of all his family, but a perfect hater of the men that now rule, as he has often told me privately; and I have it from very good hands that he is at this time very deeply discontented at the present change; insomuch that I verily believe if he ever be gained it is at this conjuncture. The trueth is he hath left behind him a very good stake, two thousand pounds per annum, with a wife and ten small children, and it's no small matter will reward him for such a losse.'

It seems fairly certain that we have here the explanation of that caution which appears throughout as the distinguishing characteristic of Mountagu's conduct; he could not afford to take risks which an unfettered man might have laughed at. He would not commit himself in Charles's interest till he felt that the current of general opinion was setting strongly in Charles's favour and that his own fortunes would be considered. This is not saying that he was greedy or avaricious. A wife, ten children and a small estate compel the most open-handed man to look closely to ways and means; and Mountagu showed no intention of moving in the matter till he had a distinct offer of an earldom, a Garter and any command or office which he might desire.

As between Mountagu and Charles there was probably, from this time, a fairly clear understanding; but to the world at large Mountagu remained an officer of the English Government, though the members of that Government had shrewd doubts about the dependence that could be placed on him. They sent over three commissioners to be with him as colleagues in the negotiations, and privately to keep watch on his doings. One of these was Algernon Sydney, a man of observation and ability, and a republican, prepared, as he afterwards showed, to go to any extreme in support of his ideas. Between him and Mountagu there sprang up almost of necessity

an antagonism, veiled indeed in relation to home politics, but open enough in regard to the avowed purpose of the mission. It finally took the definite form of a difference as to whether peace between the northern powers should be enforced by a joint fleet, or whether this duty should be performed by the Dutch alone, while the English fleet returned 'to attend the 'security of the nation at home, and protection of trade'— and incidentally, to give Mountagu the opportunity of employing it in the service of an attempted restoration.

Two of the new commissioners agreed with Mountagu that the fleet should return; that, indeed, was the instruction from England, where the new Government proposed to supersede Mountagu and put Lawson in chief command. Sydney presumably judged that the temper of the fleet would lead it rather to obey Mountagu, and that its return to England might be dangerous.

Fully to explain the arguments on one side and the other, their force and relative value, would require much more space than we have at command; the one which for the moment silenced Sydney was the report from Goodsonn that the ships were short of provisions, so short, that if they stayed longer they could not go at all; so generally short, that those to go could not be provisioned from those to stay. So Mountagu, with the whole fleet, returned to England, in time to hear of the complete failure of the royalist rising, which, though it broke out in several counties, came to a head only in Cheshire, and is commonly known by the name of its leader there, Sir George Booth. The Council, accepting Sydney's report and protest, promptly ordered Mountagu to go back, but yielded to the representations of Goodsonn, who seems to have acted throughout as an honest seaman, with no concern in politics. The Council was convinced of the motive of Mountagu's return; gossip or rumour was everywhere; but there was no real evidence, and the Government felt far too shaky to force a covert enemy into active hostility. So they contented themselves with relieving Mountagu from his command. As Mr. Harris neatly puts it:

'He was elbowed out of his work, and for the rest of the year he retired to Hinchingbrooke, while the affairs of the kingdom went rapidly into a more crazy condition. Lambert, who was said to aim at filling Cromwell's shoes, and Fleetwood, who was partly led

by him, pulled one way; the Parliamentary Republicans pulled another. . . . It only needed a downright disagreement among the rulers to provoke further discontent, to upset the government, and to make a Stewart restoration the best promise of a remedy for the nation's sores.'

That 'downright disagreement' was not long in coming. The party of the Army was for the government of one man, Fleetwood or Lambert, but at any rate a soldier; the party of Parliament wished for a republic and a civil control of the army; between the two there seemed no possibility of a settlement. The army in Scotland and the fleet represented two powers independent of the contending parties; the decision clearly rested with them; if they acted together, they could order the event. It was to Monck, the commander of the army of Scotland, that both sides appealed, and Monck, without declaring his intentions, set his army on the march.

It is fair to suppose that Monck's idea was that the nation should decide. The Army was not the nation; the Rump, that called itself the Parliament, was not the nation; and even the Parliament which had been elected twenty years before was not the nation now, in 1660. Monck's proceedings were perfectly logical, and do not ask for royalist intrigues (of which there were plenty), or royalist bias (of which there is no evidence) to explain them. He was in the position of arbitrator, but an arbitrator who had the power to enforce his decrees, and his decrees were that the Rump should recall the Parliament, that the Parliament should dissolve itself in accordance with the Act of 1641, and that a new Parliament should be freely elected, to declare the will of the country. Mountagu, who all this time had been at Hinchingbrooke, came up to town as a member of the old Parliament. What correspondence he had had with Monck, we do not know; that there had been some we may be sure, and lodgings at Whitehall were allotted to him; he was elected to the Council of State; was restored to his rank as Colonel in the army; was named a Commissioner of the Admiralty, and, with Monck as a colleague, was appointed 'General at Sea for next summer's expedition.'

It is here that Mountagu's active share in the enterprise begins. Monck was busy on shore, and Mountagu took the command of the fleet. As Commissioner and General he carried out a reform in the commissioned ranks of the fleet.

Mr. Harris considers that he and Lawson were 'enemies,' but has not stated the evidence on which he has formed that opinion. The one thing of which we are sure is that at this time Lawson, superseded in command of the fleet by Mountagu, was continued in it as vice-admiral. His influence among the seamen was deservedly great. He was a sailor before he was a politician, and a sailor he continued to be. As a general, Mountagu was respected; as a sailor Lawson was loved; and between them, there was no doubt that in the spring months of 1660 the fleet was ready to support the restoration of King Charles.

The part the fleet had in the Restoration was extremely small, and passive rather than active, until it was called to cross to Schevening and bring the king to England. There was, as is well known, a good deal of correspondence, most of which was destroyed, and none that remains seems of much importance, politically speaking. The rewards to be given to Mountagu had been categorically promised before he moved, although the parties to the bargain went through the form of considering them free gifts. 'You have given me a great task 'to carry myself towards you as you deserve,' wrote Charles, adding that he would be ashamed if Mountagu was not satisfied with his kindness.

'The gracious reception,' answered Mountagu, 'your Majesty hath vouchsafed to give the humble tender of my Loyaltye unto you, proceedes from the same fountaine your first grace towards me came, namely your Royall and Princelye mind, greate in forgivinge injuries, and extending favour freely. . . . My life and fortune shall ever be devoted to your service.'

And yet it would be unjust to think of Mountagu, who now became Earl of Sandwich, as merely mercenary. So far as we can judge, he would have preferred the restoration of Richard Cromwell, and would have exerted himself for that to his own risk. But Richard was quite impossible; Monck, as King George, he does not seem to have thought of; and he was not prepared to sacrifice his personal interests for the Stuart. These once provided for, the attitude of neither Charles nor the Earl of Sandwich, during the months and years that followed, hints at any suspicion on either side that Sandwich's loyalty was not genuine and received as such. On the contrary, he was employed from the first in offices that

speak eloquently of perfect trust, such as, in September, to bring over the Princess Royal from Holland; in January, to conduct the Queen Mother and the Princess Henrietta to France; and in May, as admiral and commander-in-chief for a foreign expedition, which took the form of bringing the king's bride from Portugal, after endeavouring to force terms of peace on the Algerine pirates and arranging for the occupation of Tangier.

There seems something peculiarly happy in the chance that assigned this duty to Sandwich. Now that Oliver Cromwell and Blake were dead, there was no man in England who had so carefully studied the advantage of securing a hold on the Straits. Gibraltar had been thought too costly in the acquisition, and here was Fortune putting an equivalent into our hands, if only we could grasp it. It was Sandwich's business to see that we could, and he did so. Naturally, foreign nations were opposed to our holding this. To Portugal, who ceded it, it was a matter of sentiment; they regretted it. To Spain it was a threatening danger to have a probable or even possible enemy nestled at their very gates; besides which they maintained that Portugal was a vassal state and had no power to cede territory over which Spain alone had sovereign rights. Holland saw a restraint to her trade in having a rival thus planted in what might easily be made into a toll-gate. Above all, France, whose ministers, with wider aspirations, perhaps saw further into the matter than others, objected to the limitations which the English, in such a position, might place on French designs. That for the time everything was settled, every opposition overcome, was Sandwich's doing. That our abode there was unceasingly troubled, so as to be a continual source of danger and exaggerated expense both in men and money, was certainly due to the action of Spain, direct and indirect.

So the new Queen was brought safely home, and for the next two or three years Sandwich remained attached to the court, though often at Hinchingbrooke and occasionally at sea; all the time in nominal command of the fleet, and subject to the veiled antagonism, if we ought not to say jealousy, of the Duke of York and the Duke's followers, especially Coventry, the Duke's secretary and confidant. Amid all was the sale of Dunkirk, the responsibility for which, to the

public, rested on the Earl of Clarendon, whose share in it was merely that of official intermediary. The onus really lay on Sandwich and the Duke of Albemarle, and, very possibly, most on Sandwich. It is quite clear that in the disordered state of the finances, both ports—Dunkirk and Tangier—could not be kept up, and from Sandwich's point of view there was no doubt that Tangier was the more useful and important. The retention of Dunkirk would be very certain to provoke a war with France, and would then become difficult or even impossible. This is indeed the common-sense view of the matter. As for the sentiment involved, Sandwich, who had helped to take Dunkirk, was as well able to judge as the public, who knew little or nothing about it. At any rate, it was sold.

There was meantime much at court to annoy Sandwich. An easy-going man in politics and in religion, he found himself in a society of hungry place-seekers or intolerant bigots, and his life, when in town, was not too pleasant. In 1664 the second war with the Dutch broke out, and seemed to call Sandwich to active service. The intrigues about this are curious and unsavoury. Sandwich, though not a sailor, had now been many years at sea in command of fleets, and had no doubt gained a considerable insight into the art of naval war. But the Duke of York was Lord High Admiral, and, though he knew nothing about the navy, wished to be in the position of Commander-in-Chief. There was some doubt as to the advisability of the presumptive heir to the throne commanding the fleet in war time; and Prince Rupert put in a claim, both as the king's cousin and as having a certain amount of nautical experience. He was certainly more of a sailor than Sandwich, but very much less of an admiral. Sandwich's study at sea had been the duty and command of fleets; Rupert's, the way of conducting a few small cruisers in face of a powerful enemy—a hole-and-corner business, to which he had brought both daring and ingenuity. Finally, it was arranged that the Duke should command in chief, with Rupert as vice- and Sandwich as rear-admiral.

The exact history of this war is one that is much to be desired, and it is to be hoped that when the time comes the writer of it may have the opportunity of working with Sandwich's Journal before him. Mr. Harris has not been able to devote the necessary space to it, nor, we may say, the technical

knowledge that could interpret the problems of it; nor has he always shown that accuracy in little things which leads to confidence in more important statements. Holmes, for instance, at forty-two, was not especially 'young'; and the Vlie, whether island or channel, cannot be called a 'river.' But in one respect he gives a true, though very unfavourable, account of our navy and its unreadiness. There has of late years been a fashion for extolling the care and attention which Charles gave to his navy. That he did so, as far as words went, is true, but the performance was sadly wanting. Indeed it is difficult to see how it could be otherwise, when the finances were in such disorder and money voted for the navy was squandered on other and unworthy objects. The necessary results were peculation, shortage of stores—and what stores there were, very bad—shortage of men, and, worst of all, desertion. Mr. Harris tells of 15,000 English seamen serving in the Dutch fleet. The essential fact is well substantiated, though the numbers are certainly exaggerated and could not possibly be known.

For the rest, Mr. Harris's story of the war is limited to the first year, during which Sandwich was afloat, and is largely taken up with the action off Lowestoft.

Mr. Harris slurs over the conclusion of the battle, in the ignominy of which Sandwich was in no way involved, and of which the story must be read elsewhere; but the suspicion that the Duke of York was entangled in it had perhaps as much to do with his supersession from the command as his being the heir to the crown, to which alone Mr. Harris ascribes it. It was proposed to appoint Rupert and Sandwich joint Commanders-in-Chief, having their flags in one ship, but Rupert would not have it. Penn seems to have been spoken of, but he was inferentially tainted with the disgraceful end to the battle of Lowestoft, and his gout was a very plausible reason for not calling on him. So Sandwich was appointed to the sole command, and had charge of the attack on the Dutch merchant ships in Bergen, which failed—not, as Mr. Harris seems to think, for want of a proper understanding between the fighting men and the diplomats, but rather for want of such an understanding between the diplomats of England and Denmark. To some extent the failure was made good by the subsequent capture of part of the convoy, including four 50-gun ships and

two large and rich East Indiamen, the 'Phenix' and the 'Slot 'van Honingen,' which, as the 'Slothany,' appeared in the list of our navy for many years.

These prizes proved, however, the source of much trouble. There was at that date no regulation about the assignment of prize money, except that it all belonged to the crown, and might be allotted, in any proportions, to the captors or anybody else. But everything above hatches was fair plunder. This was tantamount to a rule that the hatches were not to be taken off, or, as it was commonly said, bulk was not to be broken except by order of the crown. Yielding to the urgency of his colleagues, Sandwich anticipated the king's order, broke bulk and shared out a considerable part of the prize goods. The king's order was obtained afterwards; there does not appear to have been any injustice about the transaction, but there was much irregularity; and those who had hoped and intended to benefit by the prize and did not do so were noisy and vehement in their accusations of fraud. There can be no doubt that Sandwich's conduct was exceedingly ill-judged, especially as he knew that a large faction about the king was most hostile to him, and that it was not in the king's nature to resist social pressure. He was superseded from the command of the fleet, though given speedy compensation by being appointed ambassador to the court of Spain.

It would be pleasant to speak at length of this mission to Madrid, in his account of which Mr. Harris appears at his best. He tells how in the course of it the earl succeeded in negotiating a treaty between Spain and Portugal, as well as one between Spain and England, and gives many interesting details of court life at Madrid. But the press of space compels us to pass by with a bare mention this important incident in the life of Sandwich, as well as his appointment as President of the Council for the Plantations. Sandwich took this appointment very seriously, and has written copiously in his Journal both on the suggestions that reached him and upon his own ideas. On this little-known subject the Journal is of singular interest. Here, for example, is a pregnant passage with regard to the people of New England, who

'are likely to be mighty rich and powerful, and not at all careful of their dependence upon old England. . . . I take the way of roughnesse and peremptory orders, with force to backe them, to be

utterly unadviseable. . . . If wee use severity towards them in their Government, civill or religious, they will (being made desperate) sett up for themselves and reject us.'

This brings us to the practical end of Mr. Harris's original work, for the volume of Sandwich's Journal current at his death was blown up at the same time as its author, and was not recovered. In all, he has given us an interesting account of a man whose character, familiar as it is through the immortal Diary, bears much illustration. But we cannot help expressing regret that in doing this he has shown a very practical adhesion to the dogma that history is science, not literature. We believe that the dogma is a twofold heresy, and in any case that a biography ought to be literature. Possibly Mr. Harris might be willing to give a theoretical assent to this proposition; but he has taken little pains to give practical expression to it. His pages are so frequently disfigured by slipshod English, by Yankeeisms, and by false or confused metaphors, as to deprive them very largely of the literary value they ought to possess. 'Tis a pity, for the matter of the volumes is good, and deserved a more careful setting.

WALTER SCOTT AND JOANNA BAILLIE

Unpublished Letters of Sir Walter Scott to Joanna Baillie. Here printed for the first time by the kind permission of the President of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and with the approval of Miss Hunter Baillie.

THE death of Mrs. Drew in her hundred-and-first year, at Ardencaple House, Helensburgh, on August 14 last, snaps perhaps the last existing human link with Sir Walter Scott, and forms a convenient occasion for bringing to light some hitherto unpublished letters from the great novelist to an earlier and more famous friend, Joanna Baillie. Mrs. Drew first met her great compatriot in her aunt's house at Orbiston, Lanarkshire, in 1829. Scott, though then broken in health and fortune and rapidly nearing his end, seems to have retained his genius for friendship with the young. He took a fancy to the girl of eighteen, drove with her along the Clyde Valley, and presented her with copies of his works as they appeared. We are, indeed, reminded of the friendship of Sir Walter's famous contemporary and correspondent for the eighteen-year-old Ubrika von Lewetzow, a friendship, however, which merged characteristically into a warmer feeling on the part of the ever-impressionable Goethe. Ubrika died at the age of ninety-five in quite recent years, and fancied herself the last inamorata of the prince of amorists. Old Mrs. Drew was no belated lady-love of Sir Walter's, and, indeed, the Scotsman's whole relations with women were saner and sounder than those of the German genius, whose 'affairs,' on a count being made, appear to have been about seventeen in number. The Baroness von Stein was in some sort Goethe's Egeria; Scott's was certainly Joanna Baillie. Of his charming and wholesome friendship with her the following pages endeavour to give some account.

The 'Baillie Letters,' * now in the Library of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, have been in great part reprinted. Pope's, Swift's, and Arbuthnot's letters, which form part of the collection, were published by Mr. Aitken in 1892

* See also article in Chambers's Journal, 1st of January 1906.

in his 'Life and Works of Dr. John Arbuthnot,' while many of Sir Walter Scott's letters to Joanna Baillie have been incorporated either in the classic pages of Lockhart's 'Life,' or in Mr. Douglas's 'Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott' (1890–92).

There remain, however, some twenty of the novelist's letters to Joanna Baillie, and to other members of her distinguished family, which seem to have escaped the curiosity of editors for the simple reason, probably, that they were not either so readily decipherable as the others or that they appear in outlying parts of the Baillie Collection. Sir Walter, a rapid and voluminous penman, at no time writes a very readable script, differing in this particular from Alexander Pope and Dean Swift, whose letters, in the same collection of autographs, are models of clear caligraphy. Sir Walter, indeed, in a letter to one of his sons confesses that his own handwriting looks better than it is. It is in fact more plausible than readable.

Still, even when writing hurriedly and indistinctly during long sittings in the Sessions House in Edinburgh, Scott is always himself, always interesting. His unpublished letters, moreover, dovetail into several groups of well-known quoted epistles, to which they are supplementary. No apology, therefore, need be tendered to Scott-lovers by the present compiler, who is fully alive to the sentiment that any relic of Scott, however inconsiderable, is sure to awaken in the hearts of the faithful.

Sir Walter first made the acquaintance of Joanna Baillie during a visit paid by him to London in 1806. They were introduced by William Sotheby, the ex-officer of dragoons and translator of the 'Oberon' of Wieland. Joanna Baillie, whose 'Plays on the Passions' Scott had enthusiastically admired since their first publication in 1798, confessed herself

'at first a little disappointed, for I was fresh from the Lay, and had pictured to myself an ideal elegance and refinement of feature; but I said to myself, If I had been in a crowd, and at a loss what to do, I should have fixed upon that face among a thousand, as the sure index of the benevolence and the shrewdness that would and could help me in my strait. We had not talked long, however, before I saw in the expressive play of his countenance far more even of elegance and refinement than I had missed in its mere lines.'

'The acquaintance thus begun,' says Lockhart, 'soon 'ripened into a most affectionate intimacy between him and 'this remarkable woman.'

Between the years 1808 and 1827 some seventy letters were written by Scott to the English poetess. These are all preserved in the Baillie Collection.

A letter dated the 20th of September 1808 (capriciously misdated by Lockhart) is the earliest of the series. It is endorsed in the old-world handwriting of Joanna Baillie—'The first letter 'I received from him.' Then come two other letters of that year, quoted in Lockhart, and another of the 15th of August 1809, reprinted by Mr. Douglas, before we reach the first of the unpublished letters, undated as to month and day, but probably sent from Ashestiel, Scott's first country-house, and the second, written from that address on the 13th of October 1809. Both refer to Joanna Baillie's 'Family Legend,' a play which ran for fourteen nights in Edinburgh and achieved popularity. The plot of this play refers to a Highland tradition concerning the feud between the Duke of Argyll and the Chief of the Clan Maclean. Lady Louisa Stuart's criticism cannot now be traced. The letters are reproduced with the original punctuation—in fact, exactly as written.

'1809

'My dear Miss Baillie,—I cannot resist transmitting you the enclosed both because I think the general applause of my friend Lady Louisa Stuart is very valuable and because I think the criticism it contains is at least plausible. We think of setting off on Wednesday and so soon as I shall reach Edinburgh I will have a confab: with Mr. Siddons. I have got from Mrs. Maclean a drawing of the ancient dress of an Highland Lady—also the colours of the tartans worn by the Macleans and Campbells which contrast strongly and mark the different parties on the stage. Mrs. S. sends her best love and I am with unfeigned respect truly yours W.S.'

'13th *Oct.* 1809.

'Since I had the honour to write to you my dear Miss Baillie I have had some further discussion with Mr. Siddons our manager upon the subject of the family Legend with which I am more delighted upon every perusal. I have the enclosed letter from him on the subject of the *unrighteous Mammon* but I have given him plainly to understand that although in the event of the success of the piece being (from a stupidity of which I cannot suppose an audience capable) such as barely to recompense his outlay with some little profit, I do not think you would wish to diminish it, yet that if as I hoped & expected the *run* should be such as the piece

deserved I would by no means depart from your just title to a share at least of the advantage such run might secure him. In this I have no doubt of his acquiescing although from the theatre which is temporary being of a very small size I fear the utmost will fall greatly under what I formerly supposed. I find that £300 ,, is all that they give for a new piece at Drury or Covent Garden so that the players are even worse than the booksellers to the unhappy authors.

'To go to what you will be more interested in—After great consultation and the best means of enquiry being resorted to, W. Erskine and I have definitively come to be of opinion that the actual name Mac Lean must be drop'd. The highland prejudices are still glowing though in embers and we really find it would be most unsafe to venture upon what a numerous and hot-headed clan might though most unjustly take in Dudgeon. We submit therefore that the Chief may be called *Duart* (actually the name of his property) & the Clan either *Clan Gillian* or isles-men or Mull-men or any other substitute. The reality might be in this manner preserved while at the same time it was so thrown into shade as to give no offence to modern Macleans. From the want of tolerable actors one or two subordinate parts must be thrown together but this as a matter of temporary necessity we may be able to arrange.

'It strikes me that Allen of Dara whose recall from banishment so strikingly marks Maclean's character ought to be one of the vassals who leave Ellen on the Rock. I have some fear also that the scene in the cavern is rather long chiefly because the same arguments of superstitious potency which are used to seduce the vassals are necessarily repeated to the Chief—perhaps they might be abridged in the first instance. For a different reason there will be difficulty in introducing the shrieks of the seer and the piper at Argyles chamber door though both incidents are highly in character and read most admirably. But when a ludicrous effect may easily be produced by the stupidity of a low actor or by his willful buffoonery it is dangerous to lead him into temptation. The dying scream of Polonius and the crowing of the cock in Hamlet never fail to be greeted by the laughter of the audience. I do not make any apology my dear and admired friend for these observations which are dictated by my most anxious wish that the action may be as successful as possible. If being able to repeat the play were sufficient qualification I could act any character in it myself. And the oftener I have read it over the more I admire it. I read it last week to a plain sensible worthy couple who make no pretence either to literature or sentiment but rather consider such things as a *bore* and they were both in tears at many passages and obviously much interested and delighted with the whole. . . .

'*Ashestiel.*'

The 'sensible worthy couple' have been lost sight of, but the Mr. Siddons here referred to was the son of the famous

actress Sarah Siddons and nephew of John Philip Kemble. Scott interested him in the Edinburgh Theatre, in which he purchased a share in 1809, and where he brought out 'The 'Family Legend' as his first production. Scott hoped that young Siddons' Edinburgh managership would draw his great dramatic relations to the northern capital, where their presence would be a help to the national theatre.

The Erskine of the letter was William Erskine, afterwards Lord Kinneder, a man of excellent taste, in whose society Scott took delight. Erskine appears again and again in the Scott annals, according to Lockhart, as a literary referee and adviser.

A long letter of Scott's to Joanna Baillie, dated the 27th of October 1809, is quoted by Lockhart with the exception of the postscript, in which the poet says :

'We think the Family Legend should come on the stage in January when the town is full and before the dancing parties commence. I would willingly attempt a prologue did I not fear that it is a kind of thing in which I may fall short. What shall we do for an epilogue. The speech of Argyle which is rather too long if addressed to the persons of the drama might if spoken to the audience answer the purpose of an epilogue.'

The last sentence suggests a desire for short cuts, but Scott really toiled hard in his correspondent's cause, acting as referee in matters of Highland costume and tradition, and writing the Prologue after all. The Epilogue was the work of Henry Mackenzie, author of 'The Man of Feeling.'

Our next unpublished letter, still dealing with the 'Legend,' is on a level with the writer's best. It follows an epistle of the 10th of January, quoted by Mr. Douglas in his 'Familiar Letters 'of Sir Walter Scott,' a compilation, in the opinion of the late Sir Leslie Stephen, ranking next to Lockhart's great work as a contribution to the biography of the famous author.

'It would be a sin and a shame my dear Miss Baillie to delay writing any longer. I hoped all *might bes* and *would bes* concerning the Family Legend would have ended this evening which was fixd for representation but Mrs. Henry Siddons has been seized with a cruel inflammation and swelling in the eyes which casts off the coming forth till next week, so I must still write in the future tense. We delayd announcing the alteration till this morning in hopes there might be some change but alas ! to no purpose. All the boxes

were taken twice over and the public expectation was greatly excited so far as we can judge every person will come disposed to be pleased so all manœuvre will be perfectly unnecessary. In case of any blunder in the performance however we have taken care to have an hundred of your admirers (for their name here is Legion) in the way of highland friends; that is through good report and bad report. I have written the prologue—sad stuff enough to be sure but I wanted to get out of the common strain of *Whilome* and *Of Yore* as for example

> 'Of yore the hardy warriors of the north
> Each in his filabeg came boldly forth
>
> or
>
> 'Whilome beneath their chieftains high command
> The plaided Gael left his mountain strand
> And much in love with lowland sheep and cattle
> By night descended to the hungry battle.

'I dont know if after all I have got into a much better strain. But I endeavoured to secure your dignity which does not admit of your suing for applause *in forma pauperis* and eke to give something of a national cast to the feelings of the Audience.

'About the casting of the piece we have done as well as circumstances would admit. The players are generally speaking tolerable and perfect in their parts. Benlora I like least but he is a good looking stout fellow and the part will bear a little ranting if he will not quite out Herod Herod.

'Maclean (or Duart) is played by a very docile and anxious performer. I flatterd him by telling him your opinion of that part which had fallen to his lot, and he is to labour to secure some sympathy for his weakness of character. Indeed as they all seem to like their parts very well and to study hard I think the piece has a chance of being performd greatly short to be sure of my feeling of its merits but yet very creditably. Mrs. Siddons plays her part very sweetly indeed. She has increased her opthalmia by crying for the disappointment. Erskine and I were constant at Rehearsal.

'This letter accompanies two volumes of the Miscellany which you so kindly honourd at my request. You will find your beautiful *Tab* in all her glory. Thomson and the Ballantynes being musical friends, have made some treaty by which he gives them the use of his words for their collection and they give him the use of some lines of the said collection for his music. In which way they have the advantage of inserting your beautiful Heath-Cock. I have another copy of the poems for Mrs. Hunter when I can find an opportunity to send them free of expence.

'My little folks have all had such colds as well beseem this bitter weather but they have proved *only* colds whereat we rejoice for they have been generally attended by fever.

'Dont think of answering this hasty scrawl—You shall hear from me fully on Tuesday—Mrs. Scott joins in kind love to Miss Agnes Baillie and I am ever yours sincerely and respectfully

'(signed) WALTER SCOTT.

'22 *January*, 1810.'

Scott's repeated frank criticisms of the actors are interesting at this time of day. The player was not then the man of education he has latterly become. Mrs. Henry Siddons was a Frenchwoman and a lively actress. Mrs. Hunter, referred to at the end of the letter, was the widow of the famous surgeon, John Hunter, to whom she stood in sharp and rather pathetic contrast. Her songs, some of which were set to music by Haydn, were published in 1806.

In a letter of the 30th of January 1810, quoted by Lockhart, that editor takes for postscript a passage from the following unpublished letter of the 31st of January. We have marked the passage with square brackets. The writer of dramatic criticism therein referred to was the elder Ballantyne, a contributor to the 'Edinburgh Evening Courant.' 'Jeffery' is the famous critic, who was editor of the *Edinburgh Review* from 1803 to 1829, when he was promoted to the Scottish Bench and became Lord Jeffrey. Sir Walter has frequent occasion to mention him in connexion with the 'Family Legend.' The Lord President was the Right Hon. Robert Blair of Avontoun, son of the author of 'The Grave,' and David Hume, subsequently a Baron of the Exchequer, was at this time a Clerk of Session with Scott. The little son referred to was Walter, afterwards Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Walter Scott, whose portrait, painted by Allan, is a familiar object at Abbotsford.

31*st. January* 1810

'MY DEAR MISS BAILLIE,—Having opportunity of a cover I take the benefit of it to add a few words to my long epistle of yesterday. Last night I was again at the theatre when the Legend went off with equal brilliancy. The shortening some of the scenes between the saving Helen from the rock and the arrival of Maclean at Inverara had the effect of tearing ornaments from a balloon. The piece was less elegant or rather in my opinion defaced but it rose more lightly. Our critics here speak highly of the tragedy. Jeffery was with us the first night & distinguished by the animation of his applause. He was I believe anxious to confute a dirty and unfounded report that he had been mustering a party against the piece. Our Lord President as good a judge of the Belles Lettres

as of the Law over which he presides called me up to the bench this moment to express his delight at having witnessed and aided the triumph of a tragedy which may rival the best in our language. David Hume (nephew of the historian) and a great admirer of the Drama says Helen is the finest model of female virtue firmness and feeling which any stage has exhibited. In short all your friends are amply gratified with your renown except myself—and I am only dissatisfied because I cannot get Garricks and Siddonses to play the very humblest parts in the piece I believe the superintending rehearsals is very like cooking a dinner and absolutely destroys the pleasure you have in seeing your labours brought upon the board however keenly they are enjoyed by others.

'Last night the house was full but not so excessively crowded as the first. The boxes were all taken and well filled although it was the 30th January and many as great tories and cavaliers as myself strained a point of political principle to give attendance. Tonight a great house is expected, and on Saturday it will be as full as the first evening. The Legend is to be acted on Monday and then intermitted for a few nights to give new zest to the public appetite. I have promised my little people that they shall attend on that evening as a brilliant reward for my little boy's attention He is flourishing in arts and arms having gained 40 places within the last fortnight and won two pitchd battles. I was of course obliged to look grave on these military successes but I am not sorry that he can *make his hand keep his head* as we Border folks say—and in a public school it is an indispensible requisite.

['A friend of mine writes dramatic criticism now and then. I have begged him to send me a copy of the Edinr. paper in which he inserts his lucubration and I will transmit it to you. He is a play-going man and more in the habit of expressing himself on such subjects than most people.]

'Our little theatre is unfortunately ill calculated for hearing a circumstance of the least possible importance in most new plays but which has been found seriously inconvenient on this occasion.

'I am writing in the court so if any nonsense has slipd into this hasty letter I request you to believe that it is good Scotch Law I beg best compliments to Miss A. Baillie and am ever Dear Madam

'Yours most sincerely
and respectfully,
'(signed) WALTER SCOTT.

'31 *January* 1810.'

On the 20th of February Sir Walter writes once more on the subject of the 'Legend.' Indeed, during the year 1810 he seems to have addressed some thirteen letters to Joanna Baillie, of which the three here quoted are now, we believe, for the first time printed. In the letter that follows he speaks of the exceptional pleasure which 'De Montfort' has given him.

Joanna Baillie's 'De Montfort,' or 'De Monfort,' was greatly admired in its day. It was brought out by Kemble and ran for eleven nights. It was revived in 1821 by Kean, who however remarked of it that, 'though a fine poem, it would 'never be an acting play.'

Nobody now reads Joanna Baillie, just as, a century hence, nobody will perhaps be reading the most admired of to-day's dramatists. But the great Sir Walter read Joanna's plays with passionate admiration. For him, as for many of his and her contemporaries, she ranked next to Shakespeare himself. In his address to William Erskine in the introduction to the third canto of 'Marmion,' Sir Walter puts into his friend's mouth the famous compliment to Joanna :

> 'Or, if to touch such chord be thine,
> Restore the ancient tragic line,
> And emulate the notes that rung
> From the wild harp, which silent hung
> By silver Avon's holy shore
> Till twice an hundred years roll'd o'er ;
> When she, the bold enchantress, came
> With fearless hand and heart on flame !
> From the pale willow snatch'd the treasure,
> And swept it with a kindred measure,
> Till Avon's swans, while rung the grove
> With Monfort's hate and Basil's love,
> Awakening at the inspired strain,
> Deem'd their own Shakspeare lived again.'

The compliment is pointed in the lines that follow where the poet confesses himself a creature of habit, a Scottish romantic singer, not a writer of tragedy in Joanna's grand style.

'*Febry* 20*th*, 1810.

'My dear Miss Baillie,—I am delighted to find by your two kind favours that the Family Legend has answered all your wishes The last time it was acted the House was almost as full as any of the preceding nights, and the reception equally enthusiastic. Notwithstanding all this how shall I find words to tell that I have tonight, for I am just returned from the theatre seen a play for the first time which has made at least an equal impression upon me. What do you think of De Montfort presented to a tossing (? topping) audience filled with dread horror and consternation. Siddons acted ten thousand times better than I ever saw him and a Mrs. Young played the Lady Jane very well indeed. Having had none of the cookery upon this occasion I really enjoyed the feast just so

much the better. You must know that my eyes have seldom flowd excepting like the rocks in the desart at the touch of the rod. But I really felt like Sir Hugh Evans Mercy upon me I have creat tispositions to cry. I met Jeffery coming out and we walked home together marvelling how you could combine so much fine and interesting feeling with the predominance of such a horrid passion.

'I need not I am sure say how much we were all gratified by your friendly and affectionate reception of our efforts which could have been of very little service had your own been less than effectual. We might well answer you like Rob Roy the summons which Mar sent him to charge at the battle of Sheriffmuir "If you could not do it without us you could not do it with us." You and I are above the forms of civility necessary in talking over these matters as the Saints in Cromwell's time got beyond religious ordinances, so I claim full credit and belief when I say that your successful business gave me more pleasure than if it had been my own, because I had that confidence in its justice which I durst not in my own case have entertained and never did entertain even in those instances in which I have been most popular.

'Miss Holford has a right to consider me as having got above the ordinances of civility with *her* too, for I certainly did receive some time (years I believe) ago, a copy of very beautiful verses addressed to my own honour and glory. But it is equally certain that I had no clue given me to find out the ingenious authoress to whose name and residence I was a perfect stranger and could find no one here who had heard of either. And I will frankly own I was not altogether displeased at a circumstance which seemed to excuse me from what is to me always embarassing writing a letter about myself and my poetry with all the commonplaces of gratitude and modesty which whether real or assumed are always trite flat and unprofitable and all this to a lady I had never seen. I must find some opportunity of scouring my scutcheon from this stain of uncourteous ingratitude and will consider how it can be done. Her Wallace is really very fine—it will not please Scotch folks because Wallace* is one of those historical characters that get beyond the reach of poetry, which when applied to them is apt to fail in a certain degree for the reasons which Johnson applies to sacred poems. But in England it ought to be and I am sure will be eminently successful and if you have any opportunity of sending to the poetess my anxious and earnest wishes for her attaining her deserved rank among the authors of the day & think it will please her to know then you will oblige me greatly by conveying them to her. She has escaped the chance of drawing the claymore in good sad earnest, by the circumstance of its not appertaining to her sex, for Sir William Cuming in right serious rage was in search of the

* 'Wallace' and 'Margaret of Anjou' were Miss Holford's best-known plays.

Author of Wallace swearing that no man that wore a head should libel the memory of the Red Cuming his ancestor.

'I have applied to my booksellers who are anxious to do the utmost for the family whom you protect. They are willing to give seventy guineas—50 payable in a bill at 6 months and 20 upon the second edition going to press. This will leave them little profit on the two first editions of 1000 each and is a bargain which I should hold a good one in my own case. But as the success of the sale will depend much upon its coming out at this very time when everybody is mad about it I think if it is to be printed separately it had better be done speedily Should the Booksellers bargain prove too good a one I will engage my own credit that they shall do farther by your protegées whatever in your judgement shall be thought equitable.

'I forwarded your letter to Siddons—his little wife received it with the deepest gratitude and I cannot doubt for one moment that your slightest wish will be their rule But we shall have pirated copies to a certainty if we do not print soon for though the Managers may keep faith yet even an underling player has often been known to pick up from memory a copy of a popular piece though how mutilated heaven knows, and the means of getting a few guineas do not so often occur as to make them very scrupulous about the choice.

'Little Charles * did not cry at the Family Legend not because he was such a pebble hearted cur as Lancelots dog Crab which did not shed a tear when the whole house was drowned in sorrow but simply because he was not there. We thought him rather too young to see [a] theatrical exhibition—it is like eating peas in the bloom to hurry our enjoyments before we can fully relish them.

'I inclose a few lines to dear Mrs. Baillie who has contrived to make me most impatient for the arrival of the waggon by telling me it contains a token of her kind remembrance. I trust she does not hope that I shall accept it however elegant in exchange for the *hug* you promised me on her part.

'You talk of my writing tragedy but I am too cunning for that. I will give you no apology for trespassing upon my warren and composing poetical romances. I have been very busy of late cobbling one for the public Would to heaven I were so near you as to read it over to you bit by bit at tea time—My best compliments attend Miss Agnes, and the Doctor without whom there is neither living nor dying in which Charlotte cordially joins.

'Ever yours faithfully,

'(signed) WALTER SCOTT.

'Begun at the drowsy of 11 at night and finished in the no less drowzy court of Session feb^{y}. 20th.'

---

* Charles Scott, born in 1800, died in 1816.

The Mrs. Young above-mentioned was the wife of a well-known actor and herself an accomplished actress. Miss Holford, afterwards Mrs. Margaret Hodson, made a certain reputation with her 'Wallace' and 'Margaret of Anjou.' 'Scott,' says Lord Byron, 'found peculiar favour and imita-'tion among the fair sex. There was Miss Holford and Miss 'Mitford and Miss Francis; but, with the greatest respect be 'it spoken, none of his imitators did much honour to the 'original except Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd.'

The literary protégés above referred to are untraced.

Miss Agnes Baillie was the life-long companion of Joanna, who addressed to her in old age the graceful birthday ode beginning—

> 'Dear Agnes, gleamed with joy and dashed with tears
> O'er us have glided almost sixty years—
> Since we on Bothwell's bonny braes were seen
> By those whose eyes long closed in death have been.'

Among these dead were the parents of the two accomplished sisters, of whom the father, James Baillie, had at one time been minister of Bothwell on the Clyde. Their mother, who died in 1806, was a sister of the famous surgeons, John and William Hunter, founders respectively of the Hunterian Museums of London and Glasgow. The Misses Baillie's house at Hampstead was the rendezvous during more than half the nineteenth century of a brilliant literary and artistic circle. Here Sir Walter delighted to visit them, and thence he set out on that memorable walk across the fields to London when he met the tramp who gave him such a start! He records the incident in a published letter. The sisters died and are buried in Hampstead churchyard, where lie other famous people. Agnes survived Joanna ten years, and died a centenarian in 1861.

Dr. Matthew Baillie, brilliant brother of brilliant sisters, was the fashionable London physician of his time, and will be more fully referred to in due course. Charlotte is, of course, Mrs. (afterwards Lady) Scott, *née* Margaret Charlotte Carpenter, whom Walter Scott married on Christmas eve, 1797.

On the receipt of Mrs. Baillie's present another graceful letter is despatched to her.

A letter of the 4th of August 1811 is partly reprinted by Lockhart. It contains many further references to the success of

Joanna Baillie as a dramatist, besides well-known passages, including one referring to the planting of Abbotsford. Daniel Terry, referred to in the course of the letter, was the ' Argyll ' of the ' Family Legend,' the speaker of its Prologue and Epilogue, and the adaptor for stage purposes of ' The Lady of the Lake,' in which he took the principal male part. His acting was greatly admired by Scott, and he was a personage in both Edinburgh and London. Scott recognised him as a gentleman, a lover of our old dramatic literature, and a connoisseur and collector. His knowledge of architecture stood the novelist in good stead in the building of Abbotsford. All lovers of Lockhart are familiar with Sir Walter's punning allusions to ' Terrifycations.' The ' tragedy of fear,' referred to in the letter, was ' Orra,' a piece admired by Miss Mitford and by Scott, which appeared in Joanna Baillie's third volume of plays in 1812.

The Mr. Henderson episode is not traceable, but the passage quoted shows once more how zealously Scott could labour in the cause of his friends' friends. The description of the ' silence of noonday ' on Minchmuir is wrongly attributed by Lockhart to a letter of a later date—24th of August. We reprint the description, but omit the long account of ' the ' cottage,' afterwards Abbotsford, which appears in Lockhart. ' Don Roderic,' refers to the ' Vision of Don Roderick,' written by Scott in aid of the Portuguese, whose lands had been laid waste by the army of Massena. The poem was published in quarto in July 1811.

The ' Edinburgh Annual Register ' had made its first appearance in 1810 in opposition to the *Edinburgh Review*, then published by Constable, the Whiggery of which was resented by Scott. The ' Register ' was his and the Ballantynes' counterblast to this quarterly. Scott was in charge of the poetical portion of the ' Register,' Southey being at the head of the historical department. The poetical miscellany in the ' Register ' had opened with a poem sent in anonymously, accompanied by a letter written by a lad of fifteen. This lad, the young poet of the letter, turned out to be William Howison, who visited Scott and with whom he corresponded for some time. In a published letter to Joanna Baillie, Scott describes the impression the lad had made upon him. ' I asked him to ' Ashestiel, and he came—a thin hectic youth, with an eye of

'dark fire, a cheek that coloured on the slightest emotion . . .
'eager for poetical fame—otherwise, of so little acquaintance
'with the world . . . that a sucking-turkey might have been
'his tutor.'

In 1823, the date of this letter, poor Mr. Howison had dwindled to a metaphysician, who viewed the world through 'immense green spectacles'!

'*Augst. 4th*, 1811.

'Here have I been my dear Miss Baillie basking among gooseberries and currants like an ungrateful pig for these three weeks past without thinking of acknowledging your kind and comfortable letter. It does me good to hear that you are well and that you are working; but I am determined *not* to believe the unpleasant part of the intelligence you give me namely that you intend to defer the publication of your future plays untill a period when (should I be then in the way to peruse them) the pleasure they must afford will be to me most painfully chequerd. So I will only thank you for your promised Xmas treat without admitting your threatnd declaration that it is to be your fey. We would willingly try another play on our little stage if you would give us an opportunity and I really think, small as it is, you will be as worthily associated with the pieces they have tried to bring out as with the *horse-play* which seems to be the fashion of Covent Garden outdoing even Johnson's prophecy that upon these boards "Hunt might box, or Mahomet might dance." We have one very intelligent accomplishd young man on our theatre Terry by name who promises to make a great figure and is indeed by far the least pedantic and most agreeable of his profession whom I ever met with. A great admirer of yours, that is included in my ideas of dramatic excellence of course. He excells in expressing the harsher and darker shades of passion and I will certainly make him study the tragedy of fear (with a view to getting it up) so soon as it comes out of the press unless you rather chuse to trust us with an unpublished one. By the way I must not forget to say that I saw Mr. Henderson in town some time ago and that he settled his matters with Mr. Ballantyne to their mutual satisfaction. I advised him before accepting Mr. B.'s offer, which he was inclined to close with at once, to write to Longmans house as they might chuse to give a larger premium in order to keep all your copyrights together. But upon enquiry I understand he found Mr. B's offer most advantageous. The Family Legend will always be a stock play in Edinburgh. It was acted several times last winter and always brought good houses. I shall most anxiously expect your volume so pray dont forget to invoke Mr. Frelings talisman to waft it to me. I can hardly in my impatience admit your rational apology for delaying the publication till a congenial period and [were it possible for me to hasten the treat I expect, by such a composition with you, I would promise to read the

volume at the silence of noonday upon the top of Minchmuir or Windlestraw-Law—the hour is allowd by those skillful in daemonology to be as full of witchery as midnight itself and I assure you I have felt really oppressed with a sort of fearful sense of loneliness when looking around the naked and towering ridges of desolate barreness which is all the eye takes in from the top of such a mountain—the patches of cultivation being all hidden in the little glens and vallies or only appearing to make one sensible how feeble and ineffectual the efforts of art have been to contend with the genius of the soil. It is in such a scene that the unknown author of a fine but unequal poem calld *Caledonia* places the remarkable superstition which consists in hearing the noise of a chace with the baying of the dogs the throttling sobs of the deer the hollo' of a numerous train of huntsmen and the " hoofs thick beating on the hollow hill." I have often repeated his verses with some sensation of awe in such a place and I am sure yours would effect their purpose as compleatly.*] Nay I would bet on their effect even during the brilliancy of the Princes fete so little does the charm of your poetry depend upon mood and time. But all these considerations will not accelerate the flight of the printers devil so I must e'en have patience.

'Don Roderic has greatly exceeded my calculation as to popularity. It is now to be squeezed into the Edinburgh Annual Register which contains by the way a tolerable account of our actors and theatricals though most imperfect and erroneous as far as the Family Legend is commented upon. There is an article by a Mocking Bird (not in caricature but in serious sadness) who gives a good imitation of Crabbe, an indifferent one of Moore, and one of me which begins very well indeed but falls off (as I think) grievously. Ballantyne says if the article is approved he expects for next year a scene in imitation of Miss Baillie and also a ditty in the manner of Southey. The author lies conceald as yet—Among the striplings whose ill fate leads them to court the muses I have lately found a young man whose genius appears to me very uncommon considering he is but sixteen. He was with me a few days ago and brought me a little goblin tale founded on a fact which has many of the faults attachd to that slovenly composition, the German ballad, but I think has also merits more than sufficient to redeem them. You know I am none of the crimps for the Muses who enlist boys under age nor am I by any means apt to give encouragement to versifiers in general. I made use of the youths application to me to direct his study towards what appears to me the most useful and improving branches of learning assuring him he could not be a poet without a general acquaintance with letters. It may turn out that he shall be no poet after all his present promise and the labour I have imposed on him. But in that case he will realize the fable of the dying peasant who told his three idle sons of a treasure conceald in his

* Reprinted by Lockhart with slight changes of the usual kind under August 24, 1811.

field. They trenched the ground in quest of it and found no treasure indeed but a most excellent crop which rewarded their labours and explaind their fathers meaning. The young man is gentle amiable and unassuming. During his stay here he told me with great simplicity how much surprized he was to hear Harry Mackenzie and I talk together like sportsmen and horse jockies at some public place. I suppose he thought we should have spoken in iambics—I tried to case-harden him a little by carrying him a walking and riding but desisted for fear of accidents after one or two sprains. I send his ballad which he has promised greatly to improve but I think it will divert you as it is. This brings me to our amiable friend Mr. Coxe * whose manners and mildness of disposition I do *entre nous* like much better than his poetry. He has beat me in the matter of the (?) brooch for I had imagined a dozen pretty things about naiads and mermaids and St. Columbus and the North and the South and Hampstead and the—but some how or other nothing came of it.'

[Here follows the passage, quoted in Lockhart's 'Life,' on Abbotsford, the hospitality of Ashestiel, and other matters.]

'Charlotte is very well and joins me in the most kind remembrances to Miss Agnes Baillie and Mrs. Baillie. I fear (yet why should I say so in the circumstances) that the fatal termination of the poor old monarchs illness will soon (if it has not already) restore Dr. Baillie to his family. I would I could augur well of what is to follow—but alas! a public defiance of morality is but a bad bottoming for a new reign—it is incalculable the weight which George III derived from his domestic conduct But we must hope the best and none is more willing to hope it than I who would do my little best for the crown of England if it hung upon a hedge-stake.

'When I shall come to rummage your portfolio and eat your pudding at Hampstead is very uncertain: if I should walk in the morning after you receive my letter, pray do not take me for a *wraith*. But it is much more likely I shall not see London for several years as I did not come up this summer when I had real and serious business to do. My most agreeable errand will be to claim the promised communication of your future plans. Adieu God bless you (signed) W. Scott.

'*Ashestiel by Selkirk*
'4 *August* .'

Joanna Baillie's published reply to the foregoing letter is friendly and graceful:

'Yourself and Mrs. Scott, and the children, will feel sorry at leaving Ashestiel, which will long have a consequence, and be the object of kind feelings with many, from having once been the

* Mr. Coxe has not been traced.

place of your residence. If I should ever be happy enough to be at Abbotsford, you must take me to see Ashestiel too. I have a kind of tenderness for it, as one has for a man's first wife, when you hear he has married a second.'

There follows Scott's letter introducing Mr. Terry to Joanna. Daniel Terry made his first appearance in London at the Haymarket Theatre in May 1812, and became a celebrated actor of old men's parts.

June 9th, 1812.

'My dear Miss Baillie,—Agreeably to your kind permission I have given Mr. Terry these credentials to wait upon you which I know he will consider as a very high honour. He studies his art with more attention to the metaphysical principles on which it is founded than any person of his profession I have ever met with. We are all agape here for the issue of these extraordinary vacillations among political persons and parties. They put me in mind of a set of restive horses turnd to grass who cannot be catchd even by the assistance of the corn-measure.

O for stern Cromwell from the dead
Or bluff old Hall to raise his head

These times and these spirits require a decision in the Executive government which I fear they will hardly find.

'I intend a long letter one of these days so I will conclude for the present with best compliments to Miss A. Baillie I am ever with sincere respect Yours very faithfully

(signed) Walter Scott.

'*Edin. 9th June* 1812.'

The political allusions in the above letter refer to the ministerial crisis of the early part of 1812, when Lord Wellesley resigned the Foreign Secretaryship and Lords Grey and Grenville refused to join Spencer Perceval, the Prime Minister. The last-mentioned was assassinated early in May, and it is remarkable that Scott does not allude to the tragedy. It would seem, indeed, as if he tempered his sentiments, in the manner of his day, to suit a woman's taste. Joanna Baillie's letters to Scott, on the other hand, are written with much verve, as though the clever woman were putting her best foot foremost in male society. She has not a trace of professional jealousy and advises her famous correspondent to write plays. 'If I must be eclipsed in my own demesne, I 'will take it from your hand rather than from any other.' The mixture of metaphor does not diminish the generosity of the sentiment.

Victor G. Plarr.

(*To be continued.*)

CURRENT LITERATURE

1. History of English Literature. By ANDREW LANG. Longmans, Green and Co. 1912.
2. English Literature, 1880–1905. By J. M. KENNEDY. Stephen Swift. 1912.
3. Papers Critical and Reminiscent. By WILLIAM SHARP. W. Heinemann. 1912.
4. Studies and Appreciations. By WILLIAM SHARP. W. Heinemann. 1912.
5. William Morris. By JOHN DRINKWATER. Martin Secker. 1912.
6. Henrik Ibsen. By R. ELLIS ROBERTS. Martin Secker. 1912.
7. A History of English Prose Rhythm. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. Macmillan and Co. 1912.
8. Essentials of Poetry. By WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON. Constable and Co. 1912.
9. Studies and Essays. By S. J. MARY SUDDARD. Cambridge University Press. 1912.
10. The Three Brontës. By MAY SINCLAIR. Hutchinson. 1912.
11. Memories of James McNeill Whistler. By T. R. WAY. John Lane. 1912.
12. Recollections of Guy de Maupassant. By his valet FRANÇOIS. John Lane. 1912.
13. Studies in Arcady. Second Series. By R. L. GALES. Herbert and Daniel. 1912.
14. China Jim. By Major-General J. T. HARRIS. W. Heinemann. 1912.

ESSENTIAL literature must of necessity be rare and cannot at once be recognised or acceptable. It springs direct from the mind of a man absorbed in his own feelings and ideas, and therefore deeply learned in what is common to humanity. It may proceed from a keen and solitary apprehension of one particular human province of experience, or from a profound and sympathetic comprehension of all. And like a drop of attar it faintly and gradually pervades the pages of commentary and criticism. It becomes the nucleus of a further literature of its own. Obviously, therefore, the more conspicuous publications of any brief period will be of a critical and biographical nature; studies of literature and

comparative studies of life, on the fringe of creative art as also upon the fringe of actuality. They will deal with material, for the most part, at least one generation old. Their office is to sift, to arrange, to classify. For the great majority of readers desires guidance, and is inclined to accept literature as it accepts many other fundamental things, more or less at second hand.

In such books the last few months have been prolific. And though few of them reach the level of work that endures because of the lofty spirit, the rich imagination that went to its making, and most of them tell the adventures of a soul among fairly familiar masterpieces, the significant feature of nearly all of them is none the less a certain energy and independence of view, or, in the unlovely jargon of the time, a tendency and drift towards the transvaluation of values. Names, aims, ideals—none is safe ; all are on their trial. We become vaguely aware that new influences are at work ; that conventions are very poor cover just now ; that man is not at ease in the same old circumstances, beneath the same old restraints, and not yet fully articulate concerning the new ; that insularity is a folly of the past ; that existence may be a riddle with an entirely unexpected answer ; and that literature, though its best must always remain the achievement of the few, is no longer the luxury but the necessity of the many.

For this widest possible audience Mr. Lang intended his ' History of English Literature.' His desire was to arouse a living interest in the books of the past ; and by so doing to induce the reader to turn to them for himself. No more in this than in anything else that he wrote is the sense of personality absent. He was the master of many and, for a literary man, of the most unlikely subjects. Fastidious and individual, he was often obliged by the very breadth of his interests, by the stubbornness of his material, to leave that idol of the true artist's heart, form, to take care of itself—a feat it usually accomplished with ease. He exulted in vigorous prejudices, delighted in treading, with wide-open eyes and a firm heart, obscure and haunted by-paths. Scornful of shibboleths, of new and high-falutin fashions, of pose, crankiness and dry formality, scrupulous as regards evidence, entirely open-minded as regards theories, he lived long enough to desire his ease in the task in hand and to earn the privilege of taking it. The ever-present

temptation of the littérateur to view the world of thought and action only through the blurred glass of print seems to have completely passed him by. A kind of gallantry like a song rings through this book; all the forlorn causes were Lang's; youth and poetry and the joys of romance; and his invaluable common-sense shines serenely above all. And though there are signs here and there that the desperate tedium, and even the vanity of the task, forced themselves into the consciousness of a most willing spirit, yet, just as often, the burden is wafted aside with a humour and whimsicality no *ennui* could long withstand. The book abounds in all the qualities that his name at once recalls both to those who delighted in his work and to those who temperamentarily enjoyed criticising its idiosyncrasies. As one gets on in life, one 'takes to' certain subjects and chooses for company thoughts, peculiarly one's own, that lightly come and go, like birds familiar with a welcoming nest. And every shady thicket of the journey is made happy by their presence. One particular phantom—Joan of Arc—shared Lang's solitude throughout this history. But he loved all the best things and idolised his chosen; he aimed straight for the man in the book, whatever century he belonged to; and men are our company here, not merely titles. His spirit never flagged; he never grew cold in interest; nor did his effort die down. He kept childhood in memory and boyhood too; and to imagination that is the very air of childhood, and to real 'things,' that are all the world to boyhood, he always bore enthusiastic witness, wherever he found them. His history, because it is based on a life lived eagerly and fully in all the most human ways, because it is lit up with a single-hearted devotion to man's chequered and heroic earthly story, is as good a book to read as it is a sound one to study.

Mr. J. M. Kennedy's 'English Literature' is of another temper and with a different aim. Its scope lies entirely outside of Mr. Lang's centuries, covering only the twenty-five years between 1880 and 1905. Of things so near home it is difficult to see the precise proportions. Mr. Kennedy's estimate of his period may or may not be just, it is certainly not sentimental. Melancholy, he considers, was the keynote of the last generation of English literature; its whole atmosphere yellow and jaundiced. One by one its most distinctive writers,

he points out, came to an unhappy end. Had the time not been out of joint, seems his paradoxical argument, men like Wilde, Dowson, and Lionel Johnson might have set it right. Had they been born in the time of the Renaissance or in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, they might have lived to rank on the same plane 'with Tasso and Pascal.' Theirs was an age of reason, of 'sickly scientificism,' not of faith; and imagination flagged in a miasmatic air. But not only science and reason: Neo-Platonism and Romanticism were also the dominant religions and Pater was the High Priest. Liberalism and democracy were the battle-cries, classical ideals were disregarded, tradition was ignored, every writer was a law unto himself; and none therefore attained to that fine balance of mind which is the only defence and refuge of the too sensitive artistic temperament. The confusedness of this introductory chapter may be more apparent than real; the effect is at any rate that of an attempt to say too much and too many things in a small space. Mr. Kennedy's terms are somewhat elastically used, are made to serve his own particular purpose, and he constantly falls back on such a word as 'inartistic' to prove the absence of qualities imperfectly defined. His free use of 'of course' is a dangerous one. With nothing are we so little likely to agree as with that which is proffered under the menace of a ghostly bludgeon. 'It was an interesting period,' Mr. Kennedy concludes, with a hint of something between *ennui* and condescension, and the safeguards he suggests against the continuance of its evils are at least quite clear. To avoid its melancholy, to escape from its romanticism, whether it be Pater's or Zola's or Shaw's—rather queer bedfellows—two things will prove of sovereign efficacy: 'an aristocratic faith, Catholic rather than Puritan 'or Non-conformist,' and the philosophy of Nietzsche. 'In 'the course of the next few years Nietzsche will beyond all 'doubt become a potent force in England.'

Mr. Kennedy writes with a kind of dryness and aloofness. Burning admirations, ice-cold hatreds make excellent reading, but a serene and definite code and calm conviction of principles make better criticism. It is a pity, however, that Mr. Kennedy has dealt with only those authors who provide him with 'melancholy' data. A survey from another point of view, that dealt with the many representative authors of the

period who have been omitted here might lead to a very different conclusion. And there are distinct traces of a pronounced personal bias in this book. Mr. Kennedy's acrid belittlement of Mr. Wells as compared with his treatment of Gissing is a case in point. As regards Wilde and Mr. Shaw—indulgent subjects for the extremist—Mr. Kennedy holds the balance pretty true. And though he has dour things to say of the pessimism of his period, he is warmly considerate as well as just to the poetry that was its outcome.

First-hand recollections of Pater—the literary influence that Mr. Kennedy so much deplores—are to be found in 'Papers Critical and Reminiscent' by William Sharp. The volume is a collection that together with 'Studies and 'Appreciations' makes up a valuable body of criticism by a writer whose own contribution to poetry and romance was published under a pseudonym that as time went on stood at last for a kind of dual personality—Fiona Macleod. Whether either William Sharp or Fiona Macleod has made any enduring contribution to literature is a question that it is quite safe and easy to leave for Time's unhurried decision. 'Rest-'less inquietude for the diuturnity of our memories unto 'present considerations seems a vanity almost out of date, 'and a superannuated piece of folly.' William Sharp accomplished what Matthew Arnold called very creditable 'journey-'work,' though in his 'reminiscences' there is a tinge of affectation here and there. Fiona Macleod was the direct offspring of Celticism—a Celticism in her case somewhat rarefied, effeminate and over-emotionalised. But that this inspiration is still living and active is proved by the work of many young writers — Mr. Seumas O'Sullivan and Mr. James Stephens, for instance, and it can boast at least three poets unquestionably safe from oblivion, 'A.E.', Synge and Mr. Yeats.

'William Morris' by Mr. John Drinkwater and 'Henrik 'Ibsen' by Mr. Ellis Roberts are 'critical studies' containing sufficient biographical material to give them more than a purely literary interest. Mr. Drinkwater, himself a poet, has written a book almost from first to last one steady refreshing shower of appreciation. But praise to be profitable —to attract readers craftily to the fountainhead—must be discriminating. If Mr. Drinkwater errs, it is on the right side

and in good company—with Swinburne ; but his very keenness and ardour are in danger of defeating his own end. How many ' perfects ' blossom in these pages ! Here and there, too, Mr. Drinkwater makes the mistake of aggrandising Morris at another's expense, even of Shelley's. ' We feel, indeed, that he ' was of sounder judgment and a finer charity than Shelley, ' who not only exposed the evils (of Society), but also left it ' gasping whilst he went naked to his dinner or made his house ' the asylum for anybody incapable of managing his own affairs.' It does Society no harm to gasp occasionally. And were the remark even just to Shelley—whose appearance in the nude was only transitory and accidental—it would be unnecessary. No one is likely to spend superlatives on Shelley's sound judgment, nor to imitate his exaggerated generosity. And who would dream now of regretting Leigh Hunt's incapacity to manage his own affairs ? But to praise well is the critic's crowning privilege, and Mr. Drinkwater avails himself of it in all sincerity and with his whole heart. Morris *was* ' a ' supremely important poet,' not less because he was so many fine human things besides. He preserved, as few poets can, ' the right balance between ideas and action.' His life was one of a ' large simplicity,' of extraordinary fire and energy. His thoughts were large and simple, and, like all men, he ' under- ' stood the things he loved.' Two things he steadily eliminated —' enquiring into the unknown and all endeavour to set the ' crooked straight.' He was a spiritual adventurer, a whole- some fanatic, and he was also a positive and creative artist. ' Indifference was the last thing of which he was capable.' He hated froth and pose, incompetence, tepidity, and it must have been owing to some suspicion or recollection of one or other of these things, and not in a moment of mere ' irrespon- ' sible conversation,' that he once rapped out that alexi- pharmical ejaculation : ' Poetry—Tommy rot ! ' Like Cory, like all men whose lives are whole, who are not puppets of some small gift they possess, he knew that at life's banquet art is only a ' side-dish,' though wine and wheat have gone to its making. He wanted man whole, uncowed by circumstance and convention, master of his work. He strayed into the past in search of Eden, but an Eden where thorns and thistles gave a tang to its milk and honey. ' Lord, give us character '—so Mr. Drinkwater sums up his poet's livelong aspiration, an

aspiration which his own work proves he himself as ardently shares.

'No serious artist has ever listened to the overstrained 'clamour of the moralist.' For art is concerned with life—whether it be the life of the world without or of the world within—and not directly with rules and regulations of conduct. Art, however, implies an artist, whole and human, and such a man can no more help concerning himself with the world's morality than with his own. It is the conflict between them, and between these moralities and his own fleeting vision of wisdom and of truth, that is the inevitable theme of the dramatist. The artist, as Mr. Ellis Roberts says, 'if one takes him as he 'ought to be, has two passions—he longs to relieve himself and 'he wants to express himself.' Most men desire to do the first, but the artist's longing is more conscious and pressing; he seeks its relief 'in any of those varied ways which we call 'artistic.' And he summons the world to listen to him. A dramatist's characters are a means to that end. They represent the many-sidedness of his own nature and of such natures as he has lived in—piercing to the essential by imaginative sympathy—in the world without. But a play is not a lyric. The dramatist, because he is in a very real sense all his characters, must be conspicuous in no single one of them. The art of the drama is to conceal the dramatist. Even his 'idea' must emanate from the whole; it is the leaven that transforms the lump but cannot be separated from it. He may ask questions—Ibsen asked many and pressing ones; he may present problems; but it is not his office to supply bald, plain, and therefore inadequate answers, nor to cut the knot.

It is Mr. Roberts's aim, then, in this study of Ibsen to steer his way cleanly and clearly between what Ibsen actually meant and did in his work, and what his disciples and detractors have falsely or unfairly read into it. But first and foremost he must appraise his art: it is not his business (it could scarcely be his pleasure) to expatiate on the marriage problem, on heredity, or on women's rights. To pierce behind Ibsen's peculiar aloofness is a more difficult feat. He was alive but a few years ago, and yet, unless we are to risk seeing others as we see ourselves, we are even less in his confidence than in 'the 'man Shakespeare's.' Beneath his correct, diplomatic, reserved exterior what kind of character was there? What kind of man

concealed himself in those curiously frigid, impersonal letters, behind that 'self-sufficing harshness'? Mr. Roberts asks himself such questions, but 'It is difficult to say.' Still the plays are ours—for dissection, for comparison, to illuminate each the others, vaguely to shadow forth their maker's silent and secret life, and to reveal him milestone by milestone on the long road whose end is starry darkness. Viewing Ibsen as craftsman (and as fellow-poet) Mr. Roberts delights in his exquisite and scrupulous technique, his economy, his bare clean speech, his 'frightful 'deliberation.' He dogs him, play after play; scrutinising every character, analysing, comparing, even now and then scolding them. But what precise 'message' has been the upshot of this insight and skill the reader will see for himself. It is a careful and exact book. Ibsen is not the man that sets hearts blazing—unless it be in admiration of his art—and he therefore offers small occasion for rhapsody. But Mr. Ellis Roberts is a profound admirer as well as a close student, and his volume is a valuable addition to a well-maintained series.

When the first Lilliputian astir, that memorable morning long ago, happened on Lemuel Gulliver stretched on his back, blissfully snoring in the dawn, there must have followed a few moments of extreme quiet and stealth, while the breathless mannikin timidly circumambulated his unparalleled find. Such is the situation of the critic suddenly only too conscious of his feeble equipment in the presence of Professor Saintsbury's prodigious 'History of English Prose Rhythm.' A first survey urges instant flight; a closer inspection kindles wonder, awe, an absorbed and enormous interest; and then the courage so sagaciously bestowed by Nature on many of the least of her innumerable species may inspire a thorough exploration—even excite dreams, verging on nightmare, of a single-handed attack. 'An, I suppose, youthful reviewer,' casually remarks Professor Saintsbury somewhere. In the presence of his immense learning, of his endless energy, *élan*, unction, elasticity, and of his sonorous modesty, every reviewer, however dimmed with age, should be restored to youth and so be certain of forgiveness for any semblance of temerity.

However one regards this History—whether as an ever-flowing fountain of 'divers delectable draughts,' as a profuse and gorgeous display of a mind rich in innumerable whimsicalities, quips and turns, as a masterpiece

of insight and analysis, or as the Paradise of the most animated bee that ever buzzed in a learned bonnet—it is treasure trove. It is as exciting as Gaboriau, as crafty as Sherlock Holmes ; it is an Odyssey of criticism. It titillates and frets, enrages, shocks, with ' Cleopatra-like variety ' and all manner of strange devices—anything to compel attention. The disciple eager to entrap his teacher is at once entangled in a footnote. The pages gape with superfluities beyond any conceivable sentence to contain in comfort or conveniently to disgorge. Its author buttonholes us ; he addresses softly the inward mind ; he races us up and down peaks of praise, commanding ' leagues of earth in beauty spread.' His *obiter dicta* would set up an essayist *cap-à-pie.* He is arrogant, dangerously meek, severely significant, parabolic. No weapon of self-expression, no essential of life (except rest), of lucidity (except breathing-space) is absent—far-fetched allusion, racy story, sentiment, romance, outlandish technicalities, juice, sap and slang. Now it is like a winter bonfire puffing up smoke and sparks under the stars ; now it is all a huge, jovial, bluff and rollicking game, and woe be to the Revisers, to the pedants, to the philologists, to the ass that brays ! And anyhow : ' It is a great thing to be able to do these things ' when you like.'

And yet, Professor Saintsbury's root-idea, that prose can be, and should be, scanned on a system of metrical feet is at first sight a desperate and distasteful fallacy. And his practice throughout the volume frequently fails to prove it anything else. Take only one inadequate instance, a well-known bit from Sir Thomas Browne, ' an early and effective example of ' an extremely simple combination ' :—' Gardens were before ' gardeners and but some hours after the earth.' The only satisfactory means of pointing the rhythm of this fragment, if foot-scansion is to be used, is to divide it into two responsive sections : ' Gârdens were befôre gârdeners | and but sôme ' hôurs after the êarth ' : with a distinct drop of the voice upon ' gardeners,' and some moments spent on ' some hours.' Professor Saintsbury scans it as follows : ' Gārdĕns | wĕre bĕfōre | ' gārdĕnĕrs | and būt | sōme hŏŭrs | āftĕr | thĕ ēarth.' But is this not a matter that can be settled only by taste, not by law ? So Professor Saintsbury continues, scanning countless lovely passages, only apparently to succeed in

defacing and distorting them with this fragmentary chop-chop.

For a long time indeed we are tempted to conclude that the fact has been ignored that poetry consists of metre and rhythm, while prose consists of no acceptable equivalent of metre (unless the paragraph be considered as a stanza), but of rhythm only. We have to wait to be thoroughly immersed in the Professor's exposition, to get about as far as page 344, before we are fully assured that he has anticipated from his earliest conception of his task—' merely a rationalised survey ' of the facts '—almost every objection that in an entirely pardonable haste can be urged against him. A passage from Hobbes on page 211, and one from Adam Smith on page 264, show that division by grouping is a familiar alternative to him. Scattered up and down his book are innumerable references to vowel and consonant music, to values and colours, to progression of assonance, cadence, recurrence of stress, ' emphasis and ' slur, pause or carry-on,' melody, symphony, polyphony ; and there is a delicious and surprisingly apposite reference to ' dreams ' that must be read as it stands. The dictum that ' Poetry is ever a slight falling from and recovery of metre ' disposes of one ungrateful misconception ; ' Foot-system of ' long and short, *which, however, you may call anything you ' like* ' ; ' Put unscanned that the reader may read it with *his* ' scansion ; ' the humorously destructive ' By scansion we ' may, as it were, *trigonometrise* it ' ; and Variety, variety, variety, reiterated again and again, dispose of nearly all the rest. Even, too, when Professor Saintsbury's ' feet '—cretic and tribrach, epitrite, molossus ; ionic *a minore* and paeon of four forms—have all but exhausted patience ; at length, it must be confessed, their real object as a means of arriving at some definite certainty, of disentangling complexity, and of ensuring a firm footing before the contest begins, is clear and considerable. The dangers and difficulties are only too apparent.

Professor Saintsbury is practically the first to enter this land of infinite promise ; he has staked out his claim and made his clearing ; and it will be a brave man and a bold who sets himself to the task of superseding his labours. ' Keats wrote ' too little (prose), except in jocular or passionate privacy, to ' need much consideration.' The ' History of English Prose

Rhythm' is compact of many things besides; but this element it has too—'a jocular and passionate privacy,' however far from that of Keats. And this, for the seeker after life in books, will remain its lure and its (endlessly provocative) charm.

After Professor Saintsbury's 'History' Professor Neilson's 'Essentials of Poetry' and Mary Suddard's 'Studies and Essays in English Literature' suggest calm after storm. Professor Neilson has made a real and fascinating book of a series of lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute in 1911. His aim has been to discover the constituents of poetry, to free its critical terminology from ambiguity. He divides all poetry into three (well-used) divisions. (*a*) Classical: the poetry of Reason, observing restraint, proportion, decorum, and dealing with the universal as opposed to the particular; (*b*) Romanticism: the poetry of Imagination, of ideals, aspiration, of subjectivity and personality, impulse, emotion; (*c*) Realism: the Cinderella of the trio—poetry characterised by the predominance of the sense of fact over imagination and reason. The last is a new name for an old phenomenon, which has been labelled elsewhere, Modernism. Professor Neilson is not a slave of the pigeonhole. He realises that analysis of this kind is only a serviceable makeshift. The clock must be put together again before it will go; and however we classify poetry, it must *go*. Few poems can be quoted that have not all these elements, though in most poems one of them usually much predominates. As for reality and the sense of fact—there are as many varieties of both as there are human beings; and one man's actual may be another's wildest romance. But Mr. Neilson, far too conscious of his difficulties to be peremptory or pedantic, has himself discovered that the naming of a fourth fundamental quality is necessary. The quality which Hazlitt calls gusto, and Wordsworth referred to when he said that the truth of poetry must be carried into the heart by *passion* and that 'poetry was the impassioned expression on the face of 'all science'—this Mr. Neilson calls 'intensity.' The end of the matter is that while classical, romantic, realistic are exceedingly useful labels, they might all be applied to verse. It is this eternally elusive, indefinable, essential thing, intensity, that alone creates poetry. It is the poet's gift to reality—the clash and interchange between the thing seen and the seer.

Without it beauty does not exist. It is what love is, suddenly awakened, called from afar, by a stranger in possession of the immortal countersign. And it adds to verse what the sun's heat and light add to all that moves upon the face of the earth. But even when Mr. Neilson has disposed of intensity there still remain Sentimentalism and Humour to be considered. His taste is delicate and yet catholic, his grasp sure, his judgement, intuition and knowledge are in admirable equipoise, and, unlike Mr. Kennedy, he finds in Romanticism, not in Classicism, the surest refuge and stronghold against the materialism and blindness of the present day.

Mary Suddard's volume is in one respect the most remarkable yet mentioned. Here are eighteen essays—nine of them originally written in French—ranging over a wide field, manifesting close study and a keen and certain handling of such exacting subjects as Shelley's idealism, Chaucer's art of portraiture, Rossetti's views on love, Wordsworth's imagination, Swift's poetry. The choice of such subjects, in the hope of anything but the most jejune results, suggests a writer intimate with books and fortified by the knowledge gained from a sustained scrutiny of humanity and a long and chequered experience of the joys and martyrdom of being alive. It suggests also a courage and confidence not quite of a kin with the foolhardiness of youth. All these things were manifestly Mary Suddard's, and they have been used surely and gravely in a volume of cautious, penetrating and constructive criticism. What quality, indeed, desirable in criticism, is absent from her book? Neither warmth nor devotion, wit, imagination, irony, intuition, humour, nor those endearing little intimacies that may make the reading of a book like a meeting between friends. And yet there is nothing in this volume to satisfy an excusable curiosity about the writer—nothing except her own work and a brief chronological table, showing that Mary Suddard was only eighteen when the first of these essays was written, and that all were finished before she was twenty. She was born May 13, 1888; she died May 29, 1909. The achievement is surely without parallel. Is there anywhere in existence so serene and illuminating a body of criticism as is contained in this book, written at the same early age? A reserved but ardent nature shines out in it, revealing how rare and gifted a spirit was fated to so short an earthly life.

There must be now few writers of any account that have not extorted some kind of biography or study from a grateful and book-loving posterity. For many, the experience has proved a kind of feast with Heliogabalus. Of one or two we can never hear too much. And of this number are the Brontës. Miss Sinclair has, in her own words, ventured to 'come out into 'the open with another Brontë book,' and offers her warmest apologies. But even if 'The Three Brontës' contained nothing but a fervid refutation of the various 'discoveries' that have been made from time to time regarding Charlotte and Emily and Branwell, or of the gossip hardly this side of slander that has gathered about the sisters, no apology would have been needed. There are not many people really caring for literature with a devotion tempered with judgement who heed fabulous theories and idle tittle-tattle, even when they are not obviously crazy. Fewer still credit them. The fable, for instance, that Charlotte was a pertinacious man-hunter, that Branwell wrote 'Wuthering Heights' (actually took the MS. out of his hat one fine day), or that Charlotte herself vengefully founded it on a passionate intrigue with M. Héger, may afford industrious pens amusement, and that is all. Would it be a matter of very grave consequence if either of the latter stories were true? The world would still have 'Wuthering Heights'; there would be one more lamentable text for the Max Nordaus; and Emily Brontë would still have written her poems. Miss Sinclair, however, bitterly resents all such aimless and defacing talk, and her book rings with vehement scorn of the foolish and the false and the merely feeble legends that have been set about by the many biographers of the two sisters. But her book is much more than that. It is a paean to genius, wise, eloquent, discerning—to Charlotte's, but above all to Emily's, Emily the unconquerable pagan, the mystic, self-schooled, self-secure. It is also a debt paid at last—how many such debts there are to every one's account and how few get paid—to childhood. She recalls how once, 'years and years ago,' hunting forlornly in her father's bookshelves, she came upon a small shabby volume bound in yellow linen. On its title-page was one bad woodcut of Haworth Parsonage. It was Mrs. Gaskell's 'Life of Charlotte Brontë.'

Tombstones always fascinated me in those days, because I was mortally afraid of them; and I opened that book and read it through. . . . I could not, in fact, put it down. For the first time I was in the grip of a reality more poignant than any I had yet known, of a tragedy I could hardly bear. . . . I knew every corner of that house. I have an impression (it is probably a wrong one) of a flagged path going right down from the Parsonage door through another door and plunging among the tombs. I saw six little white and wistful faces looking out of an upper window; I saw six little children going up and down a lane, and I wondered how the tiny feet of babies ever got so far. I saw six little Brontë babies lost in the spaces of the illimitable moors. They went over rough stones and walls and mountain torrents; their absurd petticoats were blown upwards by the wind, and their feet were tangled in the heather. They struggled and struggled, and yet were in an ecstasy that I could well understand. . . . And all through, an invisible, intangible presence, something mysterious but omnipotently alive; something that excited these three sisters; something that atoned, that not only consoled for suffering and solitude and bereavement, but that drew its strength from these things; something that moved in this book like the soul of it; something that they called 'genius.'

It is a far cry from the one book to the other, and from the one kind of genius to the other, when 'The Three Brontës' gives place to 'Memories of James McNeill Whistler' by Mr. T. R. Way. Glimpses of the artist at work on his lithographs may be gained from it—one indeed, that recalls him, tired out and exhausted, asleep over his stone. The information to be derived from it is a little technical for the novice, and it has been monotonously drawn out. Mr. Way, however, assisted Whistler for many years, and has some interesting things to tell. He was young, but remembers Whistler's passion for work, a passion which he expected a younger stomach to share; with the consequence that they both 'ate far too little food.' There are teasing references to lost and unpublishable letters. There are a few characteristically acid retorts—one, apropos of an old hat that a friend had kindly repaired in time of stress: 'A darn is premeditated poverty, but a tear is the accident of a 'moment;' and another, that is now antique but still useful: 'He said that it was not the mission of art to preach.' It is not much of a bag from so formidable a wit. 'Alas!' says Mr. Way in another passage, recalling a letter that Whistler 'should never have permitted himself to write'—'Alas, that 'a little want of tact, possibly on both sides, should have

'brought about such a lamentable result!' But tact and the 'gentle art' were never boon companions.

'Recollections of Guy de Maupassant' is a gossiping compilation, of a kind too common just now, from the pen of 'François, his valet,' who entered his master's service on the 1st of November 1883. A memory that Boswell would have envied has reproduced for all who enjoy such things brief desultory talk, some of it between master and servant, some overheard, and all of it many years old. The following is a fair example: '"How beautiful it is!" cried he, facing the sea. '"What a splendid tint! Dark violet! It is indeed lovely! '"Only, if a painter gave us that colour, those tones, every one '"would say: 'How false!'" I, too, thought it splendid.' There is little in these Recollections that is less discreet, and not much that is more valuable. Rowing and pistol-shooting feats, sportive supper-parties, practical and (as is usual with the variety) very bad jokes, star-gazing ('distinguishing the 'planets from the satellites'), ladies 'acquainted with each 'other excepting the intelligent little lady who belongs to a 'lower set,' spiders, Zola, a butcher who wept once in fifteen years, depressing details of a mortal illness—such is the 'aureate ore' that diversifies this 'sincere and humble book,' this 'not unworthy tribute to the memory of a truly great 'man.'

What with this kind of thing and the endless press of fiction, it looked at one time as if the essay, one of the most plastic and fascinating forms of literature, must go to the wall. Mr. Belloc and Mr. Chesterton have done, and are continuing to do, much to preserve it, though their extreme brevity and profuse paradoxes have left plenty of room for a modern Montaigne. Readers of 'Studies in Arcady' will be rememberers too, and will welcome a 'Second Series.' A vast miscellaneity of out-of-the-way reading and learning and seeing and thinking, and of feeling also and enjoying, has been packed into these little essays. Yet, in spite of their substantial cargo, they waft along as gaily and lightly as Shelley's paper boats under a west wind.

Mr. Gales, like William Barnes before him, has a Cause—the cause of the English countryside and of the English men and women who live, work, die there. He may wander abroad—either in time or space—but he always quickly

harks home again. Brittany in his chapters hobnobs with the muffin man, and even remembrances of French inns bring to mind a witty saying heard in an English workhouse. It is a book for the enquiring, full of book-lore, folk-lore, weather-lore, sacred trees, pilgrim shrines, marrowy words, with chapters on Hans Andersen, French picture-books, and on Pierrot. Mr. Gales's suggestion that Newman's prose—'Newman, one of 'the greatest masters of quietly exquisite prose the world 'has ever seen'—is greatly over-rated, would shock Professor Saintsbury into an unprecedented footnote. But the following 'jingle' in praise of 'the ordinary healthy man' (unknown to Nietzsche) forgives the author even that :

He eats his meat, he drinks his wine, he thrives upon his food,
He loves his lass, he sleeps o' nights, a sleep as sound and good
As St. John sleeps at Ephesus, or the dormouse in the wood.

In 'China Jim' we get such an Englishman in active service. Like a splash of scarlet in a picture, a book all vehemence and gusto, like this, would give tone to reams of reflection. It contains Major-General J. T. Harris's recollections of the Indian Mutiny and of the China Campaign of 1860 ; 'the most 'enjoyable picnic in which I have ever taken part.' The telling is bare, sharp ; not a word wasted, not an inch of embroidery. The reader lives every line of it. He returns the tiger's 'morbid stare' in Chapter I.—the tiger that 'happened 'not to be hungry' ; he relishes in Chapter III. what beer in June '57 meant ; he all but 'goes under' when the 'knives and 'other paraphernalia' are spread out in Chapter V. : 'The 'cry of "Come and have a look at Jim Harris's legs !" was a 'common one in camp.' In Chapter VI., seated on Mr. Wells's time-machine, he is a phantom guest in Simla at 'that most 'remarkable dinner-party' when fourteen guests sat down, only two of whom were able to cut up their meat. And he all but breaks the bank with the author, then 'a happy married 'man,' in Baden-Baden in 1861. Flies, snakes, scorpions, bones and bullets infest his imaginary path. But the romantic crisis of this book—hovering now on the enchanted borders of the 'Arabian Nights' and now recalling to mind the plain-tongued, bewitched adventurers of Hakluyt and of Purchas—is the author's breathless account of the looting of the Summer Palace in Pekin. There we read of the tea-chest of 'curiosities'

collected by a French officer ' pour l'honneur et pour la gloire ' around which, seated on empty vermouth boxes, squatted his ten comrades-in-arms, feasting their eyes on watches of crystal, pearls, fruits of Aladdin—a collection that ' must have been ' worth quite £100,000.' Imagination faints, one's mouth waters. But there is tragedy too. To think of the masterpieces of art and beauty that went up in smoke to heaven while the Summer Palace blazed ! Sikhs, Chinese, French, English, a gluttonous mob of licensed robbers, thronged about the burning walls :

> Then, about 4.30 P.M. (the author having just before been engaged in scraping from between the tiles of the palace ' pieces of gold and pearls '), when I was close to the gateway, I heard a voice saying ' Where's Harris ? ' and I saw Edmund Ward holding in his arms a large image of Buddha—the usual cross-legged image in the attitude of contemplation. Directly I felt the weight of the image, I knew that it was gold and told him so. . . . ' It is not ' gold, it can't be gold,' he said, and then, by way of a change, he called himself ' a d——d fool.' ' My dear fellow, it is gold,' I assured him, but this only made him rave more than ever. ' If ' you don't believe it,' I continued, ' I'll give you £500 for it now. ' But I don't want you to take it, for you are a pal of mine, and ' your image is worth a lot more than that.' This, however, seemed to increase his fury so much that I asked what on earth was the matter with him. ' The matter ! ' he cried. ' Why, I only brought ' one away, and I left 499 of them behind ! '

It was the bare fact. He had come to a lake and a temple and marble staircases and a bridge ; and there they all were, these gold gods, ' in tiers round the hall,' like plants in a hot-house, five hundred of them. Subahdar Nutha Sing had recognised the true metal ; ' Sahib, yih sonar hai,' he had said. And now (at 4.30 P.M.) that temple was two miles distant, dark was falling, the bugles were sounding, and next morning at daybreak the barbarians had left Pekin. But an unspendable gold is the boon of dreams. Edmund Ward marched away with only one scarred Buddha. The 499 are ours, and the hill and the lake and the marble staircases and the bridge ; and the serene insistency of that ' colossal figure at the ' farther end.'

The whole enthralling story is none the less a record of pitiless waste which no reflection can justify. We are accustomed to speak of the waste of Nature—the flower born to blush unseen, the sea-drowned gem of purest ray. But it is only a fallacy.

Such is not waste but superabundance, a vast margin of the unrealised and unexplored for man's imagination to wander in. He is a stranger set in a garden of delight. Like a child, he has his own little patch to plan out and keep tidy, and when, after long stooping and business, he lifts his eyes upon a universe lovely with dream and hope, around, beyond, above, he realises that ' waste ' is but a finite idea : that all changes and passes, and yet, beyond time, all *is*. A philosophic survey of the works of *man* is not so easy. His waste, not as a child of nature, but as a rational being, seems of a less happy order. And by no means least is this the case with the books he produces. Viewed as an outcome of mortal enterprise and industry, how casual and unsystematic the whole thing is ! Day in, day out, in the same steady profusion books appear, and are as swiftly swallowed up. They are the outcome of individual impulse and caprice. Rarely does State, never does Civilisation decree : ' Here is the book we want. Where is the man to write it ? ' They cluster too thick on one subject, and leave another fertile field all but unvisited ; there is no aggregate aim. Babel itself is the tower whereon the roaring printing-presses of the world are set up ; the libraries are as much the abodes of the dead as they are a haunt of cypresses for the solace of a few immortal ghosts. For author, as for publisher, the pressing question is what the public will consume, and at one meal ; leaving not too much over. And so literature only feebly keeps pace with life. Much is left undone for want of initiative, comprehension, opportunity. Much of the best that is actually achieved must perilously abide its hour and its exponents. Above all, it is the critic's hope to happen on this *elixir vitae* and to recognise it for itself. But not every day of every year distils it ; and he has to face besides a double danger : he may miss it, or, far worse, it may miss him.

WALTER DE LA MARE.

THE CHURCH MILITANT

1. **Efficiency in the Church of England.** By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D. John Murray. 1912.
2. **Archbishops' Committee on Church Finance.** Report, with Recommendations and Appendices. **Facts and Figures of Church Finance.** Supplementary volume. 2 vols. Longmans, Green and Co. 1911.
3. **Pan-Anglican Congress.** Report. 8 vols. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1908.
4. **The Increase of the Episcopate.** By C. E. A. BEDWELL. With an Introduction by the Bishop of St. Albans. Longmans, Green and Co. 1906.

TEN years ago a proposal was made to assemble a great Congress of the members of the Anglican Church from all parts of the world in order to deepen the sense of the corporate life. The Congress was to constitute both a review of the forces of the Church, and also a conference upon their strategic dispositions, the efficiency of their armament, and the progress of their campaign. At first Churchmen at home were somewhat slow in grasping the novel idea. But the work of preparation was in capable hands and people soon began to appreciate that the promoters 'meant business.' Definite questions were put forward for consideration, so that after a course of reading in accordance with carefully prepared schemes the accredited representatives from each diocese throughout the world might assemble with a clear idea of the minds of their fellow-Churchmen upon the matters to be debated. The lines of thought, which practically covered the whole range of the Church's activities, were based upon the three questions:

(1) What are the problems of supreme importance for the Church of God in your own regions?

(2) What, in your opinion, are the greatest problems outside your own regions?

(3) What is the chief corporate duty of the whole Anglican Communion, acting as one, at this time?

The replies were systematically digested and circulated with other literature for general information; so that there was genuine study combined with intercession in the preparatory

period before this great Pan-Anglican Congress assembled in the summer of 1908. Nearly 1000 members, including delegates from the American Church, attended, and the Congress attracted the attention of the public to an unexpected degree. The usual happy-go-lucky methods of the Church of England had been abandoned in favour of painstaking preparation with careful attention to detail, and the result was apparent in the enthusiasm and keenness of the meetings held in various large centres in the Metropolis. Though many people had only a faint idea of the purpose of the Congress, its deliberations were treated with respect, and the amount of space devoted to them in the press was evidence of the interest of the public.

In other ways, however, the Congress did not seem to be quite so successful as had been hoped. Many Churchfolk thought and said that the whole thing had been overdone, and welcomed with a distinct sense of relief the return to the routine of parochial life. It had been intended that the Congress should be followed by a systematic endeavour to make use of the information and criticism put forward by the numerous speakers of varying and wide experience. But attempts in this direction, including even a special exhortation from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, met with little response, so that twelve months after the Congress was over Churchfolk noted how little apparent effect it had had upon the Church of England. The thankoffering of money had been distributed, but many people were disappointed that it did not amount to a larger sum. The whole of the £350,000—all given anonymously—was assigned to the work of the Church outside the United Kingdom. It is true that the Congress furnished an opportunity for a number of devout men and women, following the example of Bishop Boutflower, to respond to the call for personal service ; but, in some cases at all events, these offers to go forth to work in the mission field would have been made under any circumstances. Nevertheless in many ways the Congress undoubtedly had an educational and an inspiring influence among Churchfolk both at home and abroad. It was certainly the primary cause of a practical endeavour, which may lead to most valuable results, to secure greater efficiency in the organisation of the Church of England.

In the discussions, both public and private, connected with

the Congress, the visitors from across the seas were in general agreement in directing attention to the weakness of the existing methods of finance in the Church of England, and the consequent failure of Churchmen to support adequately some of the most essential portions of the Church's work. Accordingly, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York appointed a Committee :

> 'to consider the position, administration, and mutual relation of the various funds which are raised for Church purposes by voluntary subscription, whether diocesan, provincial, or general, and the most effectual means of using such funds to supplement the endowments of the Church.'

The Committee was also required 'to consider the best means 'of raising and administering additional funds to supplement 'those that are now raised.' Like a Royal Commission, which reports to the Sovereign and not to Parliament, this 'Archbishops' Committee' was to make a report direct to the Archbishops and not to either of the Convocations or Houses of Laymen. It consisted of thirty-five members, including five bishops and eight other ecclesiastics of various lower ranks. But it possessed a defect common to nearly all Church bodies—some think an inevitable defect under existing circumstances—that it did not represent the thousands of keen Churchmen to be found in the large urban parishes in South and East London, Lancashire, Yorkshire, and South Wales, who give generously of their scanty leisure and means to further the work of the Church. The deliberations of the Committee suffered by the absence of representatives of this type of Churchman. The Report is, however, an excellent piece of work, for which credit, as most people know, is largely due to Canon Bullock-Webster, clerical secretary to the Committee.

It was wisely decided not to limit the scope of the inquiry strictly to finance, with the result that cognate matters received due attention and the value and interest of the Report were increased thereby.

The chief criticism advanced against the Report among the rank and file of Churchmen is that it does not deal with endowments, these being excluded by the terms of reference. But it must be admitted that it was more practical to confine the inquiry to the voluntary offerings of the Church of England, which are, so to speak, fluid, while the endowments are subjected to statutory restrictions which can only be modified with

the aid of Parliament. There seems, however, to be an important exception. The £20,000 per annum derived from the endowments controlled by the City Parochial Charities Act are assigned to Church purposes in London with so little limit upon their application that it is difficult to find a reason why they should not be dealt with by any body or bodies established in accordance with the recommendations of the Report. If an efficient organisation were created and definite principles accepted for the administration of the voluntary offerings of the Church as a whole, there would be a strong claim for the endowments to be treated in a similar way. Of the voluntary offerings amounting to about £8,000,000 per annum, about £2,500,000 represent contributions allocated to objects outside those dealt with in the Committee's recommendations.

Emphasis is laid by the Committee upon the necessity of rehabilitating the diocese as the unit of organisation, and this proposal forms the basis of their recommendations. It is more convenient, however, to consider the scheme of the Committee rather from the point of view of the individual Churchman than from that of the diocese. In their concluding remarks the Committee say:

> 'If under such a system as we have recommended every Churchman were to give not merely sums determined at haphazard, but according to his ability "as God has prospered him" from year to year, there would be no uncertainty about the due provision of funds for the Church's work, no halts in the progress of her extension either at home or beyond the seas.'

By varying, quite unnecessarily, the Apostolic injunction to each one to lay by 'upon the first day of the week' as God hath prospered him, the Committee show that they had not fully realised that the injunction is suited to the weekly wage earner as well as to the independent gentleman. They recognise, however, that it is 'necessary to instruct Church 'people more clearly in the duty of systematically contributing 'some definite proportion of their income.' Begging sermons and appeals are heard in plenty from the pulpits of the Church of England, but definite instruction is almost unknown. One of the first and most elementary reforms in regard to Church finance is for plain direction to be given to the laity as to their duty, and clear information upon the conditions of finance in

the parish, the diocese, and the Church at large. The Report itself might have given more detailed guidance to the individual, and it would be helpful if the Bishops would agree among themselves to issue pastorals to their dioceses upon the duty and practice of almsgiving. Before the issue of such pastorals it would be well to call together the incumbents, many of whom have no very clear ideas on the subject. With the assistance of the Episcopal lead here proposed a general awakening might be effected among the laity as to the necessity for systematising their money offerings to God.

The suggestion of the Archbishops' Committee is that when the layman has decided what proportion of his income should be devoted to religious purposes he should pay from it a 'Church' due.' This idea of a Church due, payable by each individual, seems to frighten many people, but there is nothing new about it except perhaps the name. In the hundreds of parishes which have adopted what is known as the 'freewill offering scheme,' thousands of Churchmen are paying each week, or month or quarter, according to their personal convenience, a contribution which they of their own free will have undertaken to give regularly. There is no compulsion beyond the moral force of a written undertaking made with the solemnity attaching to an act connected with a man's religion. Nor do the Committee propose any penalty for non-payment of the due. What they do propose is to introduce method and regularity in place of intermittent sentiment, which now, too often, guides the money offerings of individual laymen. A definite undertaking by a large number of Churchpeople to make regular contributions would have the immense advantage of providing an income of a known amount for the parochial exchequer.

This is the first important reform advocated by the Committee. The second, to put it bluntly, is the abolition of the autocratic control of the parson over the parochial exchequer.

The only money offering which the rules of the Church require during any of the services is the offertory at Holy Communion, and disposal of that money is in the joint control of the incumbent and churchwardens—strictly speaking, it cannot be devoted to extra-parochial objects. But by modern practice collections are generally made at morning and evening prayer on Sundays and sometimes on weekdays, and over the money so collected

the churchwardens have no control. The right to dispose of all money collected in church, other than the offertory at Holy Communion, belongs, according to a well-known opinion of Dr. Stephens and Sir Francis Jeune, solely to the incumbent. There is, therefore, a solid legal basis to the present position, and it must be recognised that the power which the incumbent is being asked by the Archbishops' Committee to abandon belongs to him not merely by common practice but by right. Nevertheless it is generally admitted that the more an incumbent entrusts the financial affairs of the parish to the laity, so much the more is he free to occupy himself in his own peculiar sphere as an efficient leader of the spiritual forces in the warfare against sin and indifference. Many clergymen recognising this consideration have welcomed the constitution of parochial Church Councils, and many of these councils have already advanced beyond the experimental stage. The Committee sum up their proposals upon this matter as follows :

'The creation in every parish of such a council, of which the incumbent and churchwardens should be members, would best provide the financial body or committee required, and appears to us a most important, if not essential, requirement.'

The first requisite to the introduction of a Church Council into the working of a parish is that the incumbent must be prepared to place in it a whole-hearted confidence. Experience has shown that the aid rendered by a Church Council in the working of a parish is in proportion to the extent that the council enjoys the incumbent's trust. The meetings furnish an opportunity of informing the members of the council, and through them a widening circle of Churchfolk, of the aims and developments of the work of the parish, while the actual administration of parochial affairs awakens and develops the sense of responsibility of the laity. It is a common complaint, for which there is a good deal of justification, that the laity do not make a serious business of their work for the Church. The remedy is to give them responsibility. The clergy who have this measure of faith find their reward in the vitalising effect which their confidence has upon all branches of parish work.

As regards the Church Council itself, the chief essential is that the council should be representative. For this, and for other purposes as well, it is desirable to form a roll of those who are

entitled to be regarded as 'Church Members.' The qualification, as at present generally accepted, is that a person must have the status of a communicant, that is to say, is (*a*) 'an actual communicant; or, (*b*) is baptised and 'confirmed, and is admissible to Holy Communion, and does 'not belong to any religious body which is not in communion 'with the Church of England.' The Churchfolk elect the members of the council, of whom the number depends upon the size of the parish. The theoretically difficult question of the 'rights of women' has been solved happily in practice by the election of representatives of organisations staffed with women workers. Provision is usually made for some co-opted members. In rural parishes the formation of parochial Church Councils presents some difficulty, but this is only one of many difficulties which arise from the exodus to the towns. In many cases, doubtless, there ought to be a union of parishes for all purposes, but until that can be accomplished it is hardly desirable, as the Committee suggest, to create a new body—a joint committee constituted of parishioners from one or more contiguous parishes. It would be better to make use of and vitalise the existing machinery of the rural deanery.

In fulfilling their duties as guardians of the parochial exchequer the Church Council have to remember that they are trustees—and trustees in a double degree—(1) as representatives of the donors and (2) as administrators of funds consecrated to the service of God. It is unhappily necessary to say that scrupulous care is desirable in this respect. It would not be difficult to cite examples of failure to recognise the obligations of trusteeship to an extent which would be condemned even in ordinary business affairs by the Court of Chancery, and such incidents inevitably do harm to the reputation of the Church.

Many parishes already publish full statements of accounts, but under any satisfactory system of Church finance that practice must become universal. It is desirable that the accounts should be presented in accordance with a uniform model, and to each fund should be added brief particulars of the object and the names of the administrators.

It may seem at first sight that the creation and development of the work of Church Councils might tend to deprive the office of churchwarden of its little remaining influence. On the

contrary, experience shows that the importance of this office increases wherever a Church Council is established, so that the churchwarden in such a parish holds a position of more solid worth than in the days before legislation deprived his office of its many civil duties.

According to the Committee's scheme a primary charge upon the income of the parish is to be the ' parochial quota ' towards the diocesan income. The place of the diocese in the life of the Church is a matter which receives very little attention from the average Churchman. But the whole scheme of the Committee depends upon a due appreciation of the importance of the diocese and of its value as a part of an efficient means of organisation. The head, or, as it may be expressed, the living embodiment of the diocese, is the Bishop. Unfortunately the occasions for contact between the Bishop of a diocese and the people are rare. The public institution of an incumbent is about the only occasion that gives an opportunity to the parishioners to realise the direct responsibility of the Bishop as Father in God for the welfare of the souls of the people of the parish—a responsibility which he discharges in partnership with the incumbent. In the same way, though churchwardens have their relationship to the larger life of the diocese it is rarely emphasised, and there is much slackness in complying with the rule which requires them to take oath of office before the Archdeacon, who has a disciplinary jurisdiction over their conduct. Again, the work in the parish may be furthered by grants from diocesan funds, but few of the parishioners know or are at all concerned to inquire by what means the money is made available or how it is administered. Thus the occasions when the relationship of the diocese to the parish and of the parishes to each other become apparent are the exception rather than the rule. In a normal and effective condition of Church organisation the fact that the parish is merely part of the larger whole—the diocese—would be constantly in evidence. In the words of the Committee :

' Archdeaconries, rural deaneries, and parishes, are but parts of one family, called the Diocese, of which the Father in God is the Bishop ; and just as the mutual responsibility of the family is recognised in the home, so the responsibility of the wider family, the Diocese, for the spiritual and moral well-being of all its members and for its due share in the extension of the Kingdom of God beyond

its own borders, must be recognised as essential to the well-being of the Church.'

While so many of the dioceses retain their present sizes and enormous populations, any such intimate relationship as this is incapable of realisation. The present conditions do not permit of even the satisfactory execution of the mechanical routine of Church life, quite apart from any personal contact. No body of men could hope to be organised as an effective force for the furtherance of any object, if their leaders were overloaded with work in the same way that the Bishops of the Church of England are to-day not only permitted, but almost compelled to be.

Archbishop Tait once said that 'the modern ideal of a Bishop 'is of a man in a chronic state of perspiration.' The motor may now perhaps whirl the body about in more comfort, but the mind has to suffer instead, and many Bishops can join in the lament of one of Tait's successors: 'I have no time to 'think.' Though it is inevitable under present circumstances that the head of a diocese should desire to make opportunities to be seen and heard by as many of his people as possible, far too much attention is directed to the number of public functions in which a Bishop takes part. A great deal of work of the most vital importance must remain without any public record, and requires calm, thoughtful, and sustained application.

The record of the efforts during the last eighty years to reduce the task of a Bishop in the Church of England within the compass of one man's energies and abilities is not a cheering one. A scheme of reform considered necessary four centuries ago was partially carried out in the reign of Henry VIII; but nothing further was done until the diocese of Ripon was formed in 1836. The developments since that date have failed to keep pace with the growth of population, without taking into account the overdue arrears. Prolonged and energetic agitations have been abortive or produced results wholly inadequate to the needs of the occasion. The boundaries of dioceses have been modified and new dioceses created without regard to any definite principle or even any clear perception of the ultimate effect, but merely to reconcile conflicting interests. The Bishop of St. Albans has described these changes as 'isolated patchwork measures' which 'have frequently had 'no regard for the whole Church.' In such a diocese as South-

well there never has been a reasonable opportunity for a united corporate life, and there cannot be while it consists of two areas which have no natural affinity and so long as it has for the cathedral of the bishop a church of venerable antiquity with no other qualification to be the centre of a diocese.

With the development and multiplication of organisations the defects of the present arrangements become more clearly apparent, and the demand for the creation of new dioceses is supported by much more than a desire to place the Bishops in positions in which the work of each one may be reasonably within the grasp of one man. The laity are beginning to understand that the unwieldy size of dioceses is a primary cause of defects which they have deplored but for which they have not detected the remedy. Such, for example, is the non-representative character of the bodies intended to express the views of the laity in the deliberative councils of the Church. The Houses of Laymen desire to be brought into touch with the electorate in the parishes, so that their proceedings may have more reality by receiving definite parochial support. At present the parochial Church Council, where it exists, elects representatives to the Ruridecanal Conference, which in its turn elects to the Diocesan Conference, from which again a choice is made—one for each 100,000 of the population—of representatives in the House of Laymen, so that members of that body should reach it through three others. In present circumstances the representatives of a diocese in the House of Laymen hardly know each other, and as one descends the grades it becomes increasingly difficult to establish any cohesion. Even more impossible is it for laymen to have any broad general knowledge of the work of a diocese. Anything like system or method is almost beyond attainment until the area of operations is brought within manageable dimensions. Therein lies a great obstacle to attempting at once to put into practice in the dioceses the whole scheme of the Archbishops' Committee.

A curious omission from the Committee's recommendations as regards the diocesan organisation is the entire absence of any mention of the Archdeacon, who by right and ancient custom is concerned with the direction of finance. It must be admitted that to a considerable extent the true functions of the Archdeacon have been obliterated by attaching to the office

the duties of a suffragan Bishop or of a parochial cure, with a number of other duties ; but it does not follow that there is no place for an Archdeacon in the new scheme. The chief feature of that scheme is a Diocesan Board of Finance, to which will be entrusted the levying and expenditure of the parochial quota, with such other funds as may be committed to its care. The Diocesan Board is to derive its authority from the Diocesan Conference. To this it may be objected that Diocesan Conferences have not shown themselves either desirous, or capable, of dealing with finance. Some may even doubt whether the Diocesan Conferences, generally speaking, display the ability to undertake financial control. This objection is met by the Committee with the sound contention that ' to entrust a Conference with responsible duties ' is the surest way to make that body an efficient one.' If the Church desires to secure ' the services of the ablest and most 'experienced financiers' there must be readiness to give a wholehearted confidence in order to enlist their keen active interest.

The position of the Bishop in the proposed Diocesan Board presents some difficulty. Colonial experience suggests that he should be the ex-officio chairman of the Board. A layman would naturally be vice-chairman. Whether many of the Bishops have sufficient time or quite the desirable qualities to act in this capacity, so that the Diocesan Boards of Finance may be launched upon their way with the best prospects of success, is a point upon which it is permissible to express some doubt. Possibly in this direction the Archdeacons may, by acting as deputy-chairmen of the Boards, still find a useful piece of work aptly in keeping with their office. Other duties, which might interfere, should give place to this important contribution to the Church's work. At the same time much of the Board's work would be done by Committees of which the chairmen as a general rule would be laymen.

It seems to be anticipated that the most difficult task before the Diocesan Board is the raising of the diocesan income by means of the ' parochial quota.' There is a general tendency to regard the whole thing with suspicion, but ' apportionment ' in a rough and ready way is a common feature of parochial development. A Mission Church is started in a parish. The vicar considers that the congregation can bear a certain portion

of the expense. As the work develops the amount of assessment is increased and the Mission congregation recognises its obligation. The proposal of the Committee is merely to do the same thing more scientifically and on a larger scale. Various methods are already in practice in various Churches and Provinces. The two principal are:

'(*a*) In many Churches and religious bodies the diocesan 'or central organisation is maintained by church collections; 'every parish or congregation being required to contribute a 'specified number of such collections annually towards the 'stated object.

'(*b*) In many oversea dioceses the rule commonly prevails 'of levying a percentage charge calculated on the income 'and expenditure account of each parish; all parishes being 'required each year to send in a statement of receipts and 'expenditure on a form drawn up for that purpose.'

The Committee are in favour of the latter method, but the data are not yet available to determine the details of assessment. When the majority of parishes publish an annual statement of accounts upon some uniform method, the Boards will be in a better position to estimate the apportionment based upon (*a*) the financial conditions of the parish and (*b*) the number of Churchmen and Churchwomen in each parish.

In this work, in particular, the size of dioceses will create a serious difficulty, which has been encountered already by some Diocesan Conferences in preparing schemes for applying the recommendations of the Archbishops' Committee to their own dioceses. A central diocesan body cannot have the necessary knowledge of local circumstances to determine the amount of the parochial apportionment. It is proposed, therefore, to delegate this duty to the Ruridecanal Conferences, and in some dioceses to create an even more elaborate machinery. In Wakefield, for example, a committee has recommended:

'That the sum decided upon as necessary by the Diocesan Conference to meet the diocesan expenditure for the year be raised by means of contributions to be apportioned upon the archdeaconries, rural deaneries, and parishes; and that in the case of parochial apportionment provision be made for obtaining the assistance of committees acquainted with local conditions, also for the adequate representation (if desired) of each parish when its apportionment is being considered.'

Such an arrangement would not only be cumbersome, but it also seems likely to violate a main principle of the Committee's scheme by failing to provide the wider outlook of the diocese, and by giving latitude for local pressure and petty influences. In the diocese of York it is proposed that the 'parochial 'apportionment should be made annually by the Diocesan 'Board of Finance, after making full inquiry through the local 'committees into the conditions of each parish.' It is generally admitted that the diocese of York is seriously in need of division, and care will be necessary, therefore, that subdivision for financial purposes is on lines suitable for new dioceses.

The Diocesan Board of Finance will require to determine annually the amount of money to be raised for diocesan purposes and the objects of expenditure, and the Committee note certain matters which they regard as 'essential depart-'ments' of Church Finance. Canon Bullock-Webster's original proposals were modified by the Committee, and the result is to show some ambiguity and want of clearly defined principle. He drew a distinction 'between matters vital and essential to 'the Church's well-being and matters of philanthropy and 'piety, between claims of obligation and claims of devotion; 'in a word, what belongs to the Church's charity and what 'belongs to Church finance.' He contends that the supply, maintenance and superannuation of ministers, clerical and lay, and the provision of churches and chapels, are matters wholly outside the sphere of charity. The Committee apparently did not accept his premiss, and added to the list of essential departments of Church finance the religious education of the young. Canon Bullock-Webster's group of objects is distinct, but when once it has been extended there is an opportunity for claims to be put forward on behalf of the relief of the poor, preventive and rescue work, as the Bishop of Winchester has suggested; while many would add the propagation of the Gospel in foreign lands.

The first of the departments considered to be essential for the Church's welfare is the training of candidates for the ministry. In the words of the Report:

'It is of the greatest importance that every diocese should possess, as a department of its official organisation, a diocesan committee charged with the responsibility of providing for the

selection and training of candidates for Holy Orders and for the lay ministries of the Church.'

It is not an infrequent experience of those who are constantly engaged in raising funds for the Church's work to find that it is more difficult to obtain money for the training of candidates for Holy Orders than for any other object. Without in the least desiring to excuse the remissness of the laity in this respect, it must be said that it is often due to lack of knowledge of the requirements. To a very large extent the dissemination of information must depend upon the parochial clergy. The people gladly receive it when they have the opportunity, and there is not even the necessity to make an occasion for teaching about Holy Orders, since the Ember seasons require it. On the other hand, among those who have some knowledge of the subject there may be a certain amount of reluctance in giving lest the money should be misused. There is a general impression that Ordination Candidates' Funds have been used to help into Holy Orders men who were well-intentioned and desirous of serving the Church, but who could have served to better advantage in some other sphere. This type of man was well described by the present Bishop of Truro at the Pan-Anglican Congress :

' A man who likes Church things, who enjoys teaching in a Sunday School, managing a club, who exerts a mildly good influence on others, easily comes to believe [that] he has a vocation for Holy Orders. And confident in this assured conviction he expects funds to be found for him, bishops and vicars to compete for him, all sorts of rules about qualifications and examinations to be thrown to the winds. These vocations need severe testing.'

On the other hand, when that man has plodded on for years endeavouring to equip himself for ordination at his own expense out of the scanty earnings of daily toil, and has gained practical experience of Church work, the laity would perhaps be more sympathetic than the bishops who discourage him from receiving Holy Orders.

It should be made quite clear that deaconesses are among the ordained ministers, who may at once be included in any plans for raising funds for the support and training of the ministry, since their training is thorough and their work is most valuable and greatly appreciated by those among whom they labour, in whatever sphere.

Naturally there will be hesitation for some little time in placing lay ministers on exactly the same footing as the ordained. Lay readers, for example, are not held in that general esteem which would justify an advance to that extent. They and other lay workers have come into existence to meet the exigencies of particular circumstances, and have received recognition to a greater or less degree from the authorities of the Church; but at any time it may become apparent that their places have either ceased to exist or can be filled more suitably in some other way. Their position in the Church's organisation bears none of those elements of stability which are and must remain inseparably associated with the status of Holy Orders.

A similar distinction may be drawn in respect to the maintenance of the ministry, which is specified as the second essential department of Church finance. Here, again, some of the failure of the laity to do their duty may be fairly attributed to ignorance of the actual conditions. There is a false modesty about making known the facts. It is to be hoped that the statements of parochial accounts will include as a matter of course particulars of the official income of the incumbent. Primarily the responsibility rests upon the parish. In many instances the existing conditions continue because no authoritative information is available. It is easier to arouse interest in specific instances than by general statements such as 'of the '14,000 benefices in Canterbury and York [Provinces] 4200 'fall below £200 per annum, and 1100 fall below £100 per 'annum.' To that there is a complementary consideration which has to be taken into account. A paper read by Mr. H. Stanley Maples at the Lincoln Diocesan Conference and printed in the August number of the 'Lay Reader' may be quoted in illustration:

'Around Grimsby, Horncastle, Spilsby or Rasen, we have groups of tiny parishes, of which we can only say:

Lord Bishop of Lincoln, beware, Sir!
And patrons of livings give heed!
That, in luring men out to these villages,
Ye make them all sluggards indeed.

In Grimsby deanery, No. 1, there are eleven charges with an average population of 143. In Gartree (omitting four) are eight incumbencies with an average population of 229. In Hull No. 1 (omitting two) are

eight charges with an average population of 160. In Horncastle the last seven charges have an average population of 126 ; 34 priests with an average charge of 164. What is a poor fellow to do but eat off his head with vexation, an earnest man, having nothing to do ? Take pupils, turn farmer or gardener, quarrel with wife and people ?

A further examination of the statistics in these four deaneries shows that in 19 parishes the income is less than £200 per annum, including six under £100 per annum. The total income is £2422, or less than 50*s*. per week. But the total population is only 2538, so that the income is 19*s*. per head per annum—a rate of remuneration far beyond the claims of the medical men under the National Insurance Act. The fault mainly lies with our clumsy machinery, which does not enable us to economise our resources by assigning fewer men to the dwindling population of rural parishes.

There is also a widespread impression that many incumbents with parishes of normal size do not accomplish a full day's work in the same way as a business man. The laity perhaps do not understand the special temptation of the clerical life in having no external pressure to the execution of duty like that which is brought to bear upon most other men, but they can always appreciate the man who makes for himself a carefully arranged time-table.

Archdeacon Cunningham seems to think that public opinion is specially concerned about the cathedrals, ' and they come ' to be looked upon as religious luxuries : the complaint is at ' all events made that they are greatly overstaffed.' He considers that ' the dignified aloofness of the cathedral clergy ' from parochial activities is the root of the mischief ' and desires to see the dean as ' the head of a large and vigorous ' parish.' No doubt laymen are frequently impressed by the fact that the conditions of life in cathedral cities are marked by features of the worst type ; but it is not often that the suggestion put forward by the Archdeacon is considered to be the remedy. Others besides Churchmen can realise that a strong force of clergy at the centre is of considerable value for the efficient working of the diocese. There must also of necessity be a large staff attached to the mother church of the diocese, so that the standard of the services may in all respects be the highest.

The third essential department of Church finance is the provision of pensions for the clergy. The Committee have prepared with much care a very thorough scheme upon a contributory basis. They recognise that at present general compulsion in any form is not feasible, but they recommend :

'that candidates for Holy Orders should be urged, at least before ordination as priests, to satisfy the Diocesan Committee of Pensions that they have commenced to qualify for pensions, and to pledge themselves to maintain their qualifying subscriptions, the Diocesan Committee of Pensions being empowered to contribute towards the payment required should the circumstances necessitate.'

Thus in course of time all the clergy would be brought within the scheme. Its financial stability would depend upon adequate support from the laity to supplement the individual contributions. The organisation would be diocesan, but the funds would be consolidated under the control of a Central Council with an expert staff. The establishment of such a system of pensions is not merely an act of justice to those who have done long and faithful work, but it would remove the serious harm that results to the Church from the continued incumbency of men who are no longer capable of fulfilling their duties but have no other means of support than the proceeds of the living.

Hardly less important in the interests of an efficient ministry is adequate provision for the widows and orphans of the clergy, and for clergymen in temporary necessity. There are already many funds, general, diocesan, and local, for such objects as grants to widows and orphans and unmarried daughters of deceased clergymen, and for assistance in the education of the children. The Archbishops' Committee collected particulars of 177 charities and societies, with a total income of £122,000. But there seems to be much need for consolidation and co-operation between these various organisations, and the Committee propose that it should be effected by the constitution of Diocesan Clergy Aid Fund Committees to deal with all these various objects.

To sum up : the departments of finance which have the foremost places in the Committee's scheme are the training of the ministry, its maintenance, provision for pensions and the care of dependents. The oversight of each of these departments is to be entrusted to a diocesan committee, responsible to the

Diocesan Conference and financed under the direction of the Diocesan Board of Finance.

Among other departments of finance is the provision for the erection and repair of church buildings. It is probable that in the near future church building may be a matter for anxious consideration, owing to the rapid rise in the cost of building and the expense of sites in the more prominent positions. There is a tendency to think that every new little colony of people must have its own separate place of worship, and the majority of Churchfolk are disinclined to walk any appreciable distance to church. It is of course true, as the Committee urge, that the creation of a new parish is a diocesan obligation, but care must be taken not to weaken local responsibility and still more not to encourage lazy habits. A large part of the Committee's recommendations in reference to church building are devoted to the desirability of establishing building loan funds, merely as a practical expedient for further Church extension, but without any exposition of the underlying principle. In this department of the Report an opportunity was lost to emphasise the importance of securing that churches should be adequately insured, and to condemn the criminal neglect which is prevalent. It may be that there are cases in which the payment of heavy premiums should be assisted from a diocesan fund.

Most Churchmen will agree with the Committee as to the importance of making provision for the religious education of the young, and will further agree that the training of teachers is ' a matter of vital importance ' which ' lies at the root of ' the whole problem of religious education.' The statement applies to Sunday schools as well as to elementary schools, though in respect to the former it has to be remembered that primarily they owe their existence to clerical neglect. There may be some hesitation, therefore, in financing schemes of Sunday-school reform, instead of securing that candidates for the ministry are trained to fulfil satisfactorily the important part assigned to them by the rules of the Church in the training and education of the young.

It has already been suggested that the missionary activities of the Church in foreign lands must be regarded as an essential department of the Church's work, and the Committee are willing that the expenses of the Diocesan Board of Foreign Missions

should be defrayed out of the General Purposes Fund, which is to provide the necessary working expenses of the diocesan organisation and ' to build up for the diocese a fund available ' for the furtherance of any diocesan work approved by the ' Diocesan Conference.' Little is said about this fund, probably because the Committee recognised that its support would depend largely upon the efficiency with which the other departments do their work.

The whole scheme of the Archbishops' Committee is to be completed by the constitution of a Central Board of Finance, which is declared to be ' absolutely essential to the sound ' organisation of Church finance as a whole.' This Central Board of Finance should be in the same relation to the Representative Church Council as the Diocesan Boards of Finance to the Diocesan Conferences. And just as one of the chief objects of organising upon a diocesan basis is the equalisation of parochial burdens, so diocesan inequalities would receive attention from a Central Board. Perhaps there is no more striking example in England than the diocese of Southwark. On the one side is the diocese of London, well equipped with a richly endowed cathedral and many supplementary sources of revenue, besides the *éclat* of being the diocese which is thought by the majority of people to comprise the metropolis of the British Empire. On the other side is the diocese of Rochester, with much prosperity and even wealth, but no large claims beyond the requirements of one of the national dockyards. Either diocese constitutes a striking contrast with Southwark, where the cathedral is almost without endowment, where the suffragan bishops receive stipends less than half of those of their brethren on the other side of the river, where the lack of funds compels Church work in all its branches to be organised on a humbler scale. For the greater part of the diocese serves merely as a dormitory for people whose working lives are spent in the service of residents on the other side of the river, who show but scanty acknowledgment of their material requirements and still less of their spiritual needs. It is too much to expect of any organisation of finance that it should remove such inequalities, but it might do much to direct attention to their existence and so influence general opinion in favour of the area less fortunate in point of view of material prosperity.

It is proposed that the Central Board of Finance shall have auxiliary organisations corresponding to those associated with the diocesan boards, so that there would be a 'Central Council of Training for the Church Ministry,' a 'Central Council of Maintenance,' and a 'Central Building Fund.' The Committee appear to have overlooked the education portion of their proposals, and do not suggest a Central Board of Education similar to the Diocesan Boards and the Central Board of Foreign Missions. In the meantime, of course, there are numerous matters which cannot be and are not worked solely on a diocesan basis. Clergy pensions, already mentioned, are an important example, and one of the grave injustices of the proposals for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales is the intention to sever the four Welsh dioceses from the Province of Canterbury, and so to debar them from united action for purposes with which Parliament has no concern.

While the parochial and diocesan organisation is being developed the data can be collected for central action. As an immediate beginning the section of the 'Official Year Book of the Church of England' dealing with finance might be improved. In the laborious compilation of 'Facts and Figures' prepared by Canon Bullock-Webster it was necessary to express regret for the frequent occurrence of blanks and omissions, and in the present consideration of the Report stress has not been laid upon financial details because the Committee desire that the Appendix should be regarded, not as a source of minute and detailed information, but as a means of 'gaining a wider view and firmer grasp of a difficult and intricate subject.' A standing financial committee of the Representative Church Council might at once be constituted to obtain precise information and prepare an annual report of the requirements of the whole Church and the funds available. The salient facts would naturally be reprinted in the diocesan statement of accounts, and so by various means they might be disseminated among Churchpeople.

The future prospects of this endeavour depend to a very large extent upon educating the rank and file of Churchfolk. There is clear evidence that they will appreciate information. The literature prepared for the section of the Pan-Anglican Congress, of which this Committee was the outcome, was

circulated in considerably larger quantities than that of any other section. The main reason, no doubt, was that it dealt to a greater extent with the ordinary practical work of the Church, which enlists the enthusiastic and keen support of thousands of attached Churchfolk. For this Report not only deals with the means of making financial provision for the Church's warfare, but also contains a well-considered scheme for the enlistment, training, equipment and remuneration of the forces, and for their disposition to the best advantage in the campaign. It has to be remembered, too, that the proposals of the Archbishops' Committee affect the strength and welfare of the Anglican Church far beyond the coastline of England. The representatives of oversea dioceses bore witness at the Pan-Anglican Congress to the extent to which the present absence of sound method and principle is felt in their own work through those who come out from the Mother Country expecting to find their spiritual requirements provided for them without any expenditure of thought, time, or money on their part. It is not too much to say, therefore, that well-considered and skilfully directed action along the lines advocated by the Archbishops' Committee will be of real and enduring advantage to the Church of England, in whatever part of the world its members are to be found, and so will contribute to the strengthening and uplifting of the British race.

APPRENTICESHIP AND THE TRAINING OF THE WORKMAN.

1. **English Apprenticeship and Child Labour. A History.** By O. Jocelyn Dunlop and R. D. Denman, M.P. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
2. **Problems of Boy Life.** Edited by J. Whitehouse, M.P. P. S. King and Son. 1912.
3. **Boy Labour and Apprenticeship.** By Reginald A. Bray. Constable. 1912.

'This indenture . . . witnesseth that the said Richard Selman of his own voluntary will and with the consent of his said father William Selman hath put himself an apprentice unto the said Thomas Stokes and with him has covenanted to dwell as his apprentice from the day of the date hereof until the full end and term of seven years fully to be complete and ended during all which time the said Richard Selman shall well and faithfully serve the said Thomas Stokes his master, his secrets lawfully to be kept, shall keep his commandments lawful and honest. . . . Taverns or Alehouses he shall not haunt, dice cards or any other unlawful games he shall not use, fornication with any woman he shall not commit during such time as he shall stay in his master's service, matrimony with any woman he shall not contract or espouse himself during the said term of seven years, the goods of his said master's inordinately he shall not waste nor to any man lend without his master's licence, from his master's house or business he shall not absent himself . . . by night or by day without his master's leave. . . .'

SUCH, Miss Dunlop tells us, was the promise of the old-time apprentice, and in return his master promised for himself and his executors 'to teach or cause the said 'Richard Selman to be taught and instructed in the trade art 'science or occupation of a broadweaver after the best manner 'that he can or may, with moderate correction, finding and 'allowing unto his said servant meat, drink, apparel, washing, 'lodging and all other things whatsoever fitting for an appren-'tice. . . .'

No wages are promised by the master; no premium is offered by the parent. The apprentice becomes one of his master's household and subject to his correction, and is to be taught his trade. An explanation of the nature and obligation of the engagement entered into was no doubt invariably addressed

to the apprentice when his indenture was registered ; the form preserved by the Barbers' Company, for example, exhorts him during his term of servitude to consider his time no longer his own, but the property of his master, and finishes by the excellent advice :

'to avoid the Company of the Idle, the Vicious and Profane whose Conversation and Example cannot fail, sooner or later, to debauch your Principles, and drive you into unjustifiable and destructive Practices, such as must end in your inevitable Ruin. By pursuing the Advice now given you, you will among other Advantages secure to yourself the Favour of your Master, the good Opinion of the World and what is above all, the Blessing of Almighty God.'

The usual age of apprenticeship was from fourteen to sixteen, and it was not expected to finish till twenty-one or even twenty-four. In 1560 the Common Council of London refused to bestow its freedom until the apprentice was twenty-four years of age on the express ground that 'great poverty and 'lack of living' followed from 'over hasty marriages.' So our forefathers controlled the hot blood of youth ! Doubtless their discipline was assisted by long hours of labour ; e.g. the Leathersellers in 1482 *limited* the hours of labour to those between 6.0 A.M. and 6.0 P.M., except on Saturdays, vigils and festivals, when work was to cease at three o'clock. As a rule the hours of daylight were the working hours. Eighty years later the hours of labour were laid down by the Statute of Artificers. From Lady Day to Michaelmas the working day started at 5.0 A.M. and ended at 7.0 or 8.0 P.M., with *not above* 2½ hours allowed for meals, and in the two hottest months for the midday sleep. During the winter months the working hours were from daybreak to nightfall.

The essence of the old apprenticeship system was the living with the master as one of his family and subject to his paternal control. On the industrial side the object was twofold : to ensure thorough efficiency in the workman ; and, secondly, to secure, by limiting the number of trained freemen, that there should be sufficient employment for those in the trade. To quote Miss Dunlop :

' In the opinion of the sixteenth century a wide market was best secured, not by underselling our rivals, but by producing goods of a higher standard than theirs. In all probability the Elizabethan system of apprenticeship was the most efficient system of training which

has ever been available for the mass of the nation. Certainly in its best days it was the cheapest system of education and training we have ever possessed. The nation neither paid for classrooms nor for teachers and inspectors, since the guildsmen served as inspectors, and master and boy entered into an agreement for their mutual advantage which required, therefore, no payment on either side.'

Child labour has probably always been employed in the home, and it was on the basis of home life that apprenticeship grew up. Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries apprenticeship was entirely under the control of the various guilds. In the sixteenth century it was adopted by the Government as the national system of industrial education when Burleigh passed the Statute of Artificers in 1562. As the guilds began to lose their grip the Government undertook the enforcement of the Act, which was probably best administered during the personal government of Charles I. The Civil War disorganised trade and broke down the discipline over the apprentices. Gradually free labour began to be introduced as jealousy of guild monopoly grew, and by the end of the eighteenth century apprenticeship was no longer the national system and some of its best features had been modified. Living in the master's home was no longer insisted on, and the old discipline became impossible; premiums were introduced to keep the guilds more select and wages were being paid; legal opinion was becoming increasingly adverse to monopoly; the claims of free and unapprenticed labour were recognised, and we begin to hear much about the dangers of 'restraint of trade.'

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the opinion of Parliament was strongly against the old system, and though the Committee of the House appointed in 1812 to consider petitions for the better enforcement of the Statute were greatly impressed by the arguments advanced in its favour, their report had no weight with men who desired to foster the factory. The economic ideas of the time were all on the side of *laisser faire*; the capitalist employers were for winning their markets through the employment of cheap abour and by shoddy work. The old ideal had vanished, and in 1814 the Statute of Artificers was repealed.

The position of labour was much changed for the worse; the old independent workman became a 'hand'; the predominance of the capitalist employer was ensured by the growth

of machinery, and the factory took the place of the domestic workshop. This change had been in progress some time before the actual repeal of the Statute, and the number of children employed as wage-earners outside apprenticeship had been steadily growing as their commercial value as cheap labour became evident. In 1804, in the calico trade, many young boys were employed who were turned off as they grew up; in 1806 children are reported as going to the factories from the ages of five or six.

To Robert Owen must be credited the first effective awakening of the public conscience to the need of regulation. In 1802 an Act had been passed to protect the Poor Law children—the parish apprentices—who were imported from the southern counties to feed the mills of the north with cheap child labour; but this Act gave no protection to children whose parents resided in the neighbourhood of the factories. The first Act dealing with the general child population was passed in 1819, and from that date onwards a series of Factory Acts, protecting the more helpless kinds of labour, have been placed on the Statute Book.

All these Acts are by their nature negative, and there has hitherto been no attempt to imitate the Elizabethan legislation which aimed at adequate technical training for the youth, and full employment for the trained adult. Yet twenty years ago there was much evidence before the Labour Commission that in most trades apprenticeship was obsolete, and that the character of the work had thereby been lowered; simultaneously the trade unionists were complaining of the displacement of adults by cheap and unskilled boy labour.

The twentieth century has discovered a new consciousness in both these matters. Conference after conference has discussed the revival of apprenticeship or the introduction of other methods of training efficient workmen; the question of unemployment has been forced repeatedly into public notice. The inter-relation of these two subjects was fully recognised by the Poor Law Commission, which reported that the problem of unemployment was bound up with the mis-employment of boy labour. That the public is grasping the problem is shown by the activity of the press in denouncing the evils of 'blind-'alley' occupations.

Of recent books dealing with the subject, and referred to

at the head of this article, Miss Dunlop's, though somewhat diffuse and not devoid of repetition, shows great research and gives in a handy form the result of much original investigation. The book edited by Mr. Whitehouse is a collection of disconnected essays of very unequal value. Mr. Tawney, who is both an original inquirer and sound thinker, writes on the economics of boy labour ; Mr. Spencer Gibb is a pioneer in calling attention to the exploitation of boy labour ; Mr. Horsfall is a well-known social reformer, but his contribution merely deals with the work done in Munich continuation schools, as described by Dr. Kerschensteiner, the Director of Education in that city ; the editor's contribution is of general rather than special interest. Mr. Bray's short book, on the other hand, in spite of an occasional touch of unnecessary rhetoric, gives an interesting summary of the present position and a clear statement of the suggested remedy which, on the whole, has commended itself to most of those who have thought or written upon the subject. He calls it 'Apprenticeship to the State,' but it may be said at once that by this somewhat formidable phrase Mr. Bray only means more compulsory education, and an extension of control over juvenile labour through the new advisory committees connected with the Labour Exchanges.

The root of the trouble is that at the present day the boy is hardly reckoned as a learner, but is regarded as a cheap labourer. The exigencies of competition drive the employer to select the cheapest methods of production. He cannot afford to consider the needs of the next generation. As Mr. Bray says :

> 'Survival in business is determined in the immediate future. The heavy charges on fixed capital, the interest on outstanding loans, the weekly wages bill, and the long tale of daily outgoings, make it impossible for the employer to follow proper methods of training in the hope that the new generation of workers will by their added efficiency recoup him for his expenditure. To last till that time he must live through the interval, must obtain that contract to-day, this order to-morrow, and must get it at a profit—in other words he must choose the cheapest method of production here and now ; then and next year will be too late.'

Cheap production means improved and highly specialised machinery and cheap labour. The latter is to hand in the army of boys who leave school year by year. At the time of the

inquiries made for the Poor Law Commission (1905) some 300 firms in London and the large provincial cities were asked if they had difficulty in getting boys; only twenty-nine answered that they had any difficulty, and that only in the case of the more highly skilled work for which apprenticeship was wanted. This highly skilled work is diminishing as machinery is perfected. In every form of manufacture there is a tendency to more complete specialisation; each separate process now has its machine; and as the machine-minder tends to replace the mechanic, the cheap boy labourer takes the place of the learner. The boy who is set to make one particular little piece of the finished article learns little or nothing which will help him if he comes into a shop where a different class of work is done. Boys are not moved round the factory, they are kept in their own departments; they are not taught, they are merely made to work.

It is evident that in this respect our industrial system is entirely wrong. The years of boyhood ought not only to be spent in paying for the lad's immediate maintenance, but also in preparing him for work as an adult at a wage which will suffice to maintain not only himself but a family. If the boy is used merely as a cheap labourer without acquiring some skill for his future work, he will be unfit for adult wages and will become unemployed because he cannot earn them.

The Poor Law Commission found that this 'used-up' boy was one of the most common recruits for the ranks of the unemployed; they noted the youth of applicants to distress committees; they found that between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one large numbers of boys had to shift their jobs and were perhaps for months unable to find new work.

Nothing more demoralising for a lad can well be imagined than spells of idleness alternating with short unskilled jobs which bring no increase of ability.

The census returns show that in many occupations the number of boys employed is out of all proportion to the adults, and that a majority cannot possibly be absorbed as they grow up. The trade unions have always tried to regulate the number of apprentices, but they have found themselves unable to keep out the boys who are not regularly learning. In the textile trades, with their half-timers, the men themselves have stood in the way of reform, and it was long ago pointed out that

the cotton-spinners always had about ten times as many juveniles as would suffice to recruit the trade.

Even in the trades where apprentices are taken, the age of apprenticing is generally between fifteen and sixteen, and the boys take up some casual occupation first. Mr. Tawney goes so far as to say that boys rarely remain in the same trade as they start in. He quotes the results of an inquiry into the careers of 150 Glasgow labourers, and says: 'It is rare for a boy to pass 'through less than six places between fourteen and twenty-one; 'common for him to pass through twelve; while in some classes 'he passes through twenty or thirty.' He lays special emphasis on three characteristics of ordinary boy labour: (1) the work is as a rule entirely non-educational and gives no kind of industrial training, either general or special; (2) a large number of young workers are dismissed at manhood or as soon as they ask for adult wages; and (3) these young men tend to drift into the unskilled and casual labour market. All investigators agree as to the nomadic character of boy labourers, and no worse training could well be imagined than their present casual work. Boys who have been regular and industrious at school, and who leave alert and full of hope, become, after a period of drift, dull, stupid, irregular and hopeless men.

Thus modern industrialism not only neglects the education of its future workmen, but actually demoralises many of them, and, after making its profits by using their labour while they are young and cheap, scraps them unmercifully as useless when they have reached manhood. Both the majority and minority of the Poor Law Commission record their belief that this is the case

'The difficulty of getting boys absorbed through gradual and systematic training in the skilled trades is great enough, but when to this are added the temptations, outside the organised industries, to enter at an early age into occupations which are not themselves skilled and give no opportunity for acquiring skill, it seems clear that we are faced by a far greater problem than that of finding employment for adults who have fallen behind in the race for efficiency —namely, that the growth of large cities has brought with it an enormous increase in occupations that are making directly for unemployment in the future.' (Majority Report, p. 326.)

'It has been demonstrated beyond dispute that one of the features of the manner in which we have chosen to let the nation's industry be organised is that an increasing number of boys are employed in occupations which are either uneducative (in the sense of producing

no increase of efficiency or of intelligence) or unpromising (in the sense of leading to no permanent occupation during adult life).' (Minority Report, p. 1166.)

The facts, then, of the present position of affairs are fairly well established, and this position is undoubtedly due to the growing use of machinery in the pursuit of swift and cheap production. But the use of machinery is not an evil, and the world has no intention of abandoning the machine and returning to the slower methods of medieval production. The growth of population alone renders this impossible; nor would the working classes gain if the abandonment of machinery were possible. On the whole, the purchasing power of the workman of to-day is far in advance of that of the old-time journeyman. Twenty years ago Professor Marshall enunciated much sound commonsense on subdivision of labour, and the improvement in our productive power due to machinery. It is not merely that the rapidity of production has been enormously increased, as in the textile industries, by the use of machinery, but new opportunities for human satisfaction have been created which would have been unattainable without machinery. Opinions may differ as to the ultimate benefit to the human race of cheap newspapers, but the proof that the present generation appreciates its penny or halfpenny paper is furnished by the vast sale of newspapers in all countries. Yet a whole series of elaborate machines is necessary to collect the material for a daily paper, to convert it into printed pages, and to distribute the whole swiftly throughout town and country. If the people who rant against machinery were really sincere, they would give up buying daily papers and even printed books. They would equally abstain from railway and steamship travel, and would shrink from the motor-car, and even from the democratic bicycle, as things accursed. Again, machinery enables the world to save gifts of nature that would otherwise be wasted. In the prime industry of agriculture, how many a haycrop and harvest is saved for us by the modern reaper and binder, and how many thousands of acres of Canadian prairies, where very little human labour can be obtained, have been brought under cultivation by means of machinery? So skilfully does the machine-maker adapt himself to the needs of his customers that, if an agricultural machine breaks down on the far-distant prairie, the farmer can at once telegraph for the replica of the broken part.

Above all, as Marshall well puts it, ' machinery sooner or ' later takes over the monotonous work in manufacture ' :

' The house carpenters make things of the same kind as those used by our forefathers with much less toil to themselves. They now give themselves chiefly to those parts of the task which are most pleasant and interesting ; while steam mills for sawing, planing and moulding relieve them of that grievous fatigue which not very long ago used to make them prematurely old. . . . Those trades in which work is most subdivided are those in which the chief muscular strain is most certain to be taken off by machinery.' (Marshall. ' Principles of Economics.' Book IV. Chap. 9.)

The medieval workman had little leisure ; he was too tired after his day's work to think or read, or do anything but sleep ; the machine-minder of to-day endures much less physical exhaustion and he can use his leisure well if he is so minded. To watch and tend a machine requires little physical effort and should even stimulate the mental faculties. It by no means follows, however, that to mind a machine which he does not understand is a good thing for a young boy or is instructive to him. Often the boy is only put to the lightest and simplest machine which requires very little intelligence, and he sees nothing but the process of producing some very small part of the whole.

If, then, we do not want to abolish machinery, the line of advance must be to improve the machine and abolish the boy. The boy who is a ' layer-on ' in the printing office or a ' drawer-' off ' of timber in the saw-mill must be displaced by machines that will do the work better and more regularly than he can. If the boy were not available, a self-feeding machine would soon be found to do the work. It is because the boy is there and is cheap that invention lags.

If, then, the boy is to be withdrawn, the simplest and best way is to keep him longer at school ; and this is the method suggested not only by those interested primarily in education but also by the Poor Law Commissioners.

It is, of course, true that school cannot teach all that could be learned in the workshop, but the workshop is ceasing to teach. The old system of apprenticeship was admirably suited to a period of small workshops when the boy could live under the paternal control of his master, and when both masters and men were represented by a guild which guarded the interests of the

whole trade. But in the modern large factory paternal control is impossible ; while in place of the old guilds we have trade unions and employers' associations, bodies which are less concerned for the welfare of the trade as a whole than for the respective interests of employee and employer. Some years ago there was ground for hoping that these rival bodies would ultimately work together for the common interest of the trade, but latterly they have been drifting even farther apart. The action of the present Government has done much to accentuate this growing hostility and to emphasise the militant character of the trade unions. By the Trades Disputes Acts and the Insurance Act the unions have been diverted farther and farther from their old ideals of collective bargaining, of safeguarding the workers and the trade by encouraging a proper proportion of learners and adults, and of protecting their members from undeserved misfortunes by setting aside money for sick or unemployment benefit, and have been driven into the paths of political syndicalism.

We can no longer hope for regulation of the trades by masters and men as was done by the old guilds, and therefore some other means must be found to ensure the reduction of uneducative boy labour. The only feasible way is to extend the period of compulsory school attendance, and to use the additional school time, partly or wholly, for industrial training.

Apprenticeship of a kind will doubtless remain in some trades, more especially in the artistic crafts—e.g. silversmithing and cabinet-making. Perhaps it will continue in coach and motor building, and in the printing trades it may be maintained by a strong trade union with a shortened term of years. In the building trades it has already almost disappeared. Even the plumbers, who seemed likely by the nature of their work to require more special training, are finding it less important as iron replaces lead. The engineering trades, long the stronghold of the apprentice, are becoming more and more the home of specialised processes. Only premium and privilege apprentices, who are in training for posts as foremen and sub-managers, are now getting an all-round training ; the ordinary apprentices are placed in fitting or turning shops at once, and only learn to work the machinery of their special branches. With the growth of the towns, space becomes too valuable, and the larger shops have less time for teaching, so that in the building trades

especially apprentices are no longer to be found in the large centres, and trained workmen are imported from the country. In London, a great centre of the building trade, this is especially noticeable. There are practically no apprentices in the London building trade, but the census shows that there is a great influx of trained journeymen from the country districts. In 1898 a County Council inquiry led to a report that the 'better positions 'go inevitably to the country-bred man with his all-round train- 'ing,' and it was noted that 'among the foremen and operatives 'who have come before us not one stated that he was born or 'trained in London.' In the villages, therefore, apprenticeship may linger on, and it may be no bad thing that the technical training of skilled workmen should be given in the more healthy atmosphere of country life. But the towns cannot consider such a solution as either suitable or adequate, for there is admittedly a deficiency of trained men.

At the same time it has to be realised that there is a vast and growing field of employment where a high degree of skill is not required. Mr. Tawney even notes that 'some employers 'state that the engineer of the future will be a specialised 'machine-minder . . . instead of the man who has served his 'time,' and the same consideration applies to many other industries. Even more important is the fact that the business of distribution absorbs a far larger proportion of the population than before. Not only is there an ever-increasing volume of goods to be distributed to the ultimate consumer, but modern industrial methods require an immense amount of transport work, so that parts which have been prepared by specialist makers in many different places may be assembled together in one factory. This work of transportation and distribution requires less specialised training than a skilled handicraft. It requires fair all-round intelligence and good physique, just the qualities that a school ought to be able to develop by mental and physical education. At present a good deal of this work is done by boys as well as by men, but no great increase in the cost of distribution would result if boys were kept out of this work a year or two longer. When the boy is withdrawn invention will be quickened. Already the motor is dispensing with the horse-boy ; the telephone is reducing the number of messengers ; and it is probable that even larger economies of boy labour could be effected by the

use of pneumatic tubes and other mechanical devices for delivering messages and parcels.

In addition to their present lack of industrial training, it is universally agreed that boys to-day suffer from the want of control and discipline which the old apprenticeship system gave them. The employer has no effective control, for the boy throws up his job as soon as any strict discipline is attempted. The parents again want the boy's wages and are more inclined to look on him as a paying guest, and to make things too comfortable for him, than to exercise any authority which might lead him to rebel and leave home. He becomes independent at an age when he has no power of self-control ; while long before the age when in old times his apprenticeship would have finished he is contemplating marriage, without thinking how he will be able to support a family. The result of this want of supervision is seen in instability of character, in restlessness and irregularity at work ; in fine, the boy loses those very qualities which command future success and which he was acquiring at school. For, whatever the shortcomings of the schools, the discipline in them is remarkable and the diligence and regularity of the children beyond all praise. Practically to-day no compulsion is required, and all the children who are not prevented by sickness, or some other unavoidable accident, attend daily with cheerful punctuality, and inside school give ready obedience and attention to the teachers. To turn the boys out of school at the age of fourteen, when their intelligence is just beginning to quicken, and to give them over to unbounded independence when they have no capacity for self-government, is as thoroughly bad from the point of view of character as it is absurd on educational grounds. Under present conditions three-fourths of them give up all idea of further education when they leave school. Even if they were willing to attend evening schools, their hours of labour are too long to leave them really fit to receive instruction. From a five-and-a-half-hour school day young boys find themselves plunged into a working day of about nine or ten hours, which leaves them physically exhausted. Our present system wastes the £100 which has been spent on their education, by stopping it abruptly at an age when its results are evanescent unless fixed by further study ; it lets go the orderliness and stability of character which the school has tried to inculcate, by placing

them suddenly in a position of independence which is least conducive to the maintenance of those qualities ; and it overworks them physically at the time of life when regular physical exercises and medical supervision are most important to ensure right growth.

This is not the place to discuss the curriculum of the schools ; many modifications are needed and much must be done to render school training more practical. Not only must we have a great extension of trade schools for the benefit of those entering the skilled crafts, which will create the special ability no longer to be learned in the large workshops of the towns, but we must give a general training to all those who are destined for the semi-skilled or unskilled forms of industry, for they will need general ability both mental and physical.

Even in the skilled trades the specialised ability acquired in early years may later be rendered valueless by the introduction of new methods of production, of new machinery, or of new materials. Alike in skilled and unskilled trades, general intelligence, which leads to adaptability to new kinds of work, is the best equipment for the young worker ; while steadiness and carefulness, which can be taught so well in the manual or science room of the school, are a prime requirement for every workman, whether he is handling expensive machinery or doing any of the thousand-and-one jobs of the warehouse or the shop. An additional year or two in school would develop handiness, ripen intelligence, and confirm habits of regularity and obedience.

Perhaps we must go further. The age at which control of the working boy should altogether cease is not fifteen or sixteen, but the age when the boy of wealthier parents leaves the public school or university. Apprenticeship lasted till twenty-one ; compulsory continuation-school for half the day up to the age of eighteen does not seem too much to require, both for an extension of the time of education and for ensuring the continuance of the moral control of the schoolmaster. The Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission (p. 1216) recommended ' that no child should be employed at all below the age of fifteen ; ' that no young person under eighteen should be employed for ' more than thirty hours per week ; and that all young persons ' so employed should be required to attend for thirty hours ' per week at suitable trade schools.'

Now to raise the age of school attendance for the whole day to

fifteen, and later even to sixteen, would present little difficulty. Boys are now out of work a great many months between their different jobs. Such information as we possess seems to point to an aggregate of a year to eighteen months lost between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one. A good deal of this waste time could be saved if the boy, by remaining longer at school, acquired a greater steadiness of character and increased industrial capacity. Thus the extra time spent at school would be partly recovered in time alone, while it would be more than recovered in money by the improved earning-power of the lad. Thus the extension of whole-time schooling is a comparatively straightforward proposition. On the other hand, to introduce a universal half-time system up to eighteen would require a very great change in the existing conditions of industry. Mr. Bray points out that it might be left to the localities and the trades to determine the least inconvenient arrangement of hours, which might be in half-days, in half-weeks, or even during the six slackest months of the year, as is now occasionally arranged by engineering firms which send their apprentices for long polytechnic courses. He says truly that industrially the half-time system has not worked badly in the cotton mills, and that the objections from the point of view of young children would not apply with the same force to elder boys.

The Munich law, though falling far short of a half-time system, is said to work well. General classes are held for those not engaged in the crafts, and these would probably be, in the main, the model required for England. In the summer seven to nine hours a week are devoted to school, made up as a rule by taking one afternoon from 2 P.M. to 5 P.M., and another from 4 P.M. to 7 P.M., and the rest on Sunday. In the winter, in the building trades at any rate, twelve hours a week are spent in education, the hours so occupied being from 5 P.M. to 7 P.M. daily. But before any such system could be introduced into this country it would be necessary to consider very seriously what the effect on industry would be of withdrawing boys for part of the working day, for in very many occupations boys are used to supplement the labour of the men and work with them.

If, however, all this extra schooling is to be given, the cost will certainly be considerable, and it is necessary to ask how the money is to be found. Three years ago the Education Committee of the London County Council advocated the raising

of the school-leaving age from fourteen to fifteen. They estimated that some 56,000 additional children would require school places. Allowing for the number of excess places which then existed, they suggested that only 29,000 new places would have to be provided at a capital cost of about £870,000. For the first twenty-five years they estimated the annual expenditure would be £149,115 on maintenance, in addition to £40,655 interest and repayment of the capital expenditure. After twenty-five years the latter would begin to diminish, though possibly the maintenance charges would have increased, as it is their habit to do. It would probably be unsafe to put the total annual charge at less than £200,000. The Committee did not submit any estimate for part-time classes for boys from fifteen to eighteen. If these were held outside school hours, say between 5 P.M. and 7 P.M., there would be a considerable additional expenditure on maintenance, and if half-time classes were held during school hours there would be a further large sum required for the provision of new schools. It is quite clear that the ratepayers would strongly object to this additional burden, and it is equally clear that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be reluctant to take over a new educational expenditure which might quickly increase to several millions. On the other hand, there can be no question that much of our present expenditure on education is wasted because of its abrupt termination at the age of fourteen, and it is therefore possible to argue that the additional cost would be a sound investment. This point was urged by the present writer in a little book on unemployment published two years ago :

> ' If these proposals for the better education of the workman effect their object, benefit should accrue both to individuals and to the nation. Better workmen would have an enhanced value to employers and command higher wages. With better workmen, steadier and more efficient, earning higher wages, most of our social problems would vanish. We should no longer have unhealthy and underfed children growing into puny men and women. What would be spent in education might well be saved in the Poor Law and in the relief of the unemployed.' (' Unemployment and Trade Unions.' Jackson, p. 83.)

But though it is possible to argue convincingly that additional expenditure on public education would in the long run be a good investment for the nation, we are up against the fact that

public expenditure, whether local or national, is regarded by the people who have to find the money as already excessive and requiring to be reduced, not increased. Therefore, if we are to add very considerably to the cost of public education by extending the compulsory age of whole-time schooling till, say, fifteen and by providing for half-time schooling up to eighteen, we must look round for some source of economy.

We need not look far. One of the prime causes of the great costliness of public elementary education in this country is that it begins too early. Alone among the civilised countries of the world the United Kingdom compels children to go to school at the early age of five, whether their parents wish it or not. In addition, children between the ages of three and five are received gratuitously in schools provided out of public revenue, if their parents choose to send them. Education at these ages is a farce ; and the infant schools, though maintained at a very great cost, are really little more than crèches and playgrounds. Many parents are thus relieved of almost all responsibility for the children they have brought into the world ; while other parents, who are perfectly competent to look after their children and would gladly do so, are compelled by the attendance officers to hurry their little ones off to school as soon as they have turned five years of age. An examination of the education laws of other countries shows that on the continent of Europe compulsion does not anywhere begin till the age of six, while in some States of Germany and some cantons of Switzerland it only begins at seven. In Canada the age of compulsion is seven in some provinces and eight in others. In Australia the age is six in some States and seven in others ; in South Africa it is seven in all States. In the United States of America the ages of compulsion vary, but seven and eight are the most common. It is submitted that the age of compulsion in this country might reasonably be raised to seven, leaving it still optional to parents to send their children below that age, but in that event charging fees. The resulting economy in public expenditure would render possible the extension of the school age as advocated above, and the establishment of an efficient system of half-time schooling for boys who have already started to earn a living.

At present we have boys turned out of school to work at fourteen years of age ; they enter occupations which are largely

uneducative and which often lead to no permanent employment in later years ; meanwhile they forget the lessons of the schools and become ignorant, restless, and undisciplined men, frequently stunted in physique owing to premature strain. We have as a result workmen not fitted for doing their best for the nation, their employers, or themselves, with small intelligence and little adaptability, and not therefore capable of earning wages which would enable them to bring up strong and healthy families. This state of things is partly due to the demand for cheap boy-labour for simple machinery, and for the distribution of machine products. We must dispense with this cheap boy-labour and make still further demands on invention, so that all mechanical, automatic and unintelligent work shall be done by machines. That the workman may be more capable of managing machinery, more stable and more intelligent, both as a producer and a citizen, we must retain the boy longer under the discipline of school and the instruction of teachers, who will watch the development of his body as well as of his mind. To effect this we ought immediately to raise the age of full-time attendance at school to fifteen, and make some provision for part-time instruction till eighteen. Later we may come nearer the Elizabethan ideal and extend these ages of training still further. One way may be a period of compulsory military service between eighteen and twenty, which shall include some real technical training as well as physical development ; but this raises issues which go beyond the immediate subject. Without question one of the best ways of dealing with labour unrest and unemployment is to remove from the labour market the unstable and ill-trained youths who are now engaged in uneducative and often irregular work. Such work in no way helps these immature youths to become efficient wage-earners, fit to be the fathers of the next generation, and to carry to a higher degree of perfection the industrial productivity of the nation.

CYRIL JACKSON.

DEMOCRACY AND LIBERALISM.

1. **Lord Morley : Miscellanies, Fourth Series.** Macmillan. 1908. Speeches as Chancellor of Manchester University, November 1911 and June 1912, reported in the 'Times.' Speech at Blackburn on 'Politics and Letters,' July 25, 1912.
2. **The Meaning of Liberalism.** By J. M. ROBERTSON, M.P. Methuen & Co. 1912.
3. **Modern Democracy.** By BROUGHAM VILLIERS. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
4. **The Cult of Incompetence.** (Translated from the French of Émile Faguet by BEATRICE BARSTOW.) John Murray. 1911.

MR. GLADSTONE died in 1898, and with him passed away the old Liberalism, that bundle of beliefs, maxims, and policies which, curiously compounded of the theories of Rousseau, Paine, Bentham, and the elder Mill, began to adapt itself to the practical intelligence of the British middle class after the reform of Parliament in 1832. The aims and achievements of the Liberal party were the freeing of our international trade, the removal of religious disabilities, the wider distribution of political power, the strict and economic administration of public finance, and the avoidance of war. The regnant idea of middle-class Liberalism was the freeing of the individual and the setting him to do the best he could for himself and his family. Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy was a 'side-show,' and consisted in moving back the relation of landlord and tenant from contract to status, and in beginning to lend the tenant public money to buy his land. All this while the Conservative party was moving slowly along the line of State Socialism, the landlords not being sorry to retaliate upon the manufacturers for the repeal of the Corn Law by passing factory, and workshop, and housing Acts. Both parties co-operated in making primary education compulsory and gratuitous, and both parties, with more or less insincerity, took a hand in extending the franchise. Up to this point the upper and middle classes had been getting on famously together ; they understood one another perfectly ; and the proletariat, not too uncomfortable, was dismissing both parties with 'sabre-cuts of Saxon speech' not fit for ears

polite. Into this happy family thrust himself Parnell, not so much an immoral as an unmoral man, for he did not know what scruples meant, and his hatred of the British middle-class Liberal almost made him mad. Parnell killed parliamentary government, for in gagging him we were obliged to gag ourselves, and he broke up for good and all—though it was not seen at the time—the party of middle-class Liberalism. Mr. Gladstone chose to appeal from middle-class Liberals to the proletariat, which was not ready for him, and his failure produced for twenty years a purely artificial arrangement of political parties. Whigs, Birmingham Radicals, and Tories all pigged it together in the same truckle bed : and the Coalition of 1895 was followed, as coalitions always are, by a confusion and obliteration of political principles. When Lord Salisbury died in 1903 he carried with him the old Conservatism, ' the ' conservation in England of the ancient order of things,' as surely as Mr. Gladstone five years previously had carried with him the old Liberalism.

Out of the tomb of middle-class Liberalism arose in 1906 an unformed spectre—whose advent had often been predicted, but never believed in—democracy at last ! Surprised at its own victory—nobody more so — democracy glared at the governing class and its paraphernalia, much as the mob glared at Louis and Marie Antoinette in the Tuileries. So this is the House of Commons ; and this is the House of Lords ; and this is Mr. Balfour ! Nobody knew anything about democracy, and everybody was so anxious to know : were its paths to be the paths of pleasantness and its ways the ways of peace ? Mr. Balfour envisaged the new apparition in a perfectly characteristic manner : he met it with a smile and a jest. Immediately on the opening of the new Parliament the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, tabled a resolution in which he invited the House of Commons ' to reflect ' upon its relations with the House of Lords. ' Well,' said Mr. Balfour in his deepest and most satirical tone, glancing blandly at the Government, ' let them reflect : it is a process which ' can do them nothing but good.' The Opposition laughed, the pleasant, comfortable laugh of men whose title-deeds are secure and whose relations with their bankers are quite satisfactory. Alas for the old order and its champion ! Within four years of that light retort the super-tax and the new land

taxes had become part of the national finance, and the Parliament Act had become law. But if Mr. Balfour did not see what was coming, did anybody else see farther or more clearly than he? Did any of the Radical leaders, even in the morning flush of passion after 1906, foresee that in six years they would, easily and without serious resistance, disable the House of Lords, an older branch of the Constitution than the House of Commons, and begin the break-up of the big estates of the aristocracy? For it is the ease and rapidity with which these vast changes in social and political structure have been effected that ought to alarm the moderate man. Not only was there no resistance, there was co-operation on the part of the besieged with the besiegers. The land taxes had not begun to be collected before the big landowners took to selling their possessions right and left. The power of the peers depended quite as much upon their estates as upon their undefined political rights. This Disraeli saw very clearly when he fought the battle of protection sixty years ago. Both have been taken from them; and now it is the turn of the small landowners. The squire is now discovered to be the enemy of the people, and a 'bonnet' having quickly been found in an ambitious young barrister, the order for his dispossession has gone forth. As Duke Frederick says in 'As you Like it':—

> 'Well, push him out of doors;
> And let my officers of such a nature
> Make an extent upon his house and lands:
> Do this expediently, and turn him going.'

Hardly has this edict been issued than Lord Lansdowne appears in the company of Mr. Jesse Collings and announces that the old system of landownership is obsolete, and not fitted to modern ideas, and that, as a beginning, £12,000,000 must be found by the State to help tenants to become owners. To such an extent has this sudden apparition of democracy overpowered the imagination and terrified the fortitude of the Tory leaders. It is certainly worth while to inquire what this democracy is; what are its aims; what is its relation to political parties; and how far those who have anything to lose can either resist or escape from its tyranny. It is to the answering of these questions that all the political speeches and books, from which the list at the head of this article is a fair selection, have for the last six years been directed.

Let us begin by a definition of terms. In modern States the masses can never participate personally in the executive and legislative functions: those they are forced, by reason of their numbers, to entrust to deputies. By democracy is meant that the masses are the sole depositaries of the supreme power in the State, and that King, Lords, and Commons are merely instruments for the carrying out of their orders. The demos for governmental purposes is the whole body of voters, eleven-twelfths of whom pay no direct taxes. It was apparently about four years ago that Lord Morley discovered that democracy is not the same thing as Liberalism, and the discovery annoyed him, for with all his air of polished detachment there is no stouter partisan than Lord Morley. In the 'Fourth 'Series of his Miscellanies,' published in 1908, Lord Morley complains, a little tartly, of the reaction of democracy against Liberalism, which he ascribes to four causes, the decay of religious belief, a stream of German idealism (presumably an allusion to Utopian Socialism), the success of Bismarck's blood-and-iron policy, and the belief that physical science had given its verdict in favour of violence and against social justice. With a sigh the philosopher-statesman bows democracy out of his library. 'Democracy has long passed out beyond mere praise 'and blame. Dialogues and disputations on its success or 'failure are now an idle quarrel. Democracy is what it is. Its 'own perils encompass it. They are many, they are grave. 'Spiritual power in the old sense there is none; the material 'power of wealth is formidable. Like kings and nobles in old 'time, so in our time the man in the street will have his syco-'phants and parasites.' In the last twelve months Lord Morley has been speaking again about politics and history, and his confidence in democracy does not seem to have increased. In his address as Chancellor of Manchester University, delivered on June 28 last, Lord Morley painted an unflattering portrait of the democratic statesman:

'Ardent spirits have common faults in a stirring age. We know it all. They are so apt to begin where they should end. Pierced by thoughts of the ills in the world around them, they are overwhelmed by a noble impatience to remove, to lessen, to abate. Before they have set sail, they insist that they already see some new planet swimming into their ken, and touch the promised land. An abstract *a priori* notion, formed independently of experience, independently of evidence, is straightway clothed with all the

sanctity of absolute principle. Generous aspiration, exalted enthusiasm, is made to do duty for reasoned scrutiny. They seize every fact or circumstance that makes their way, they are blind to every other. Inflexible preconceptions hold the helm. They exaggerate ; their sense of proportion is bad.'

It would be unkind to suggest that this was intended by Lord Morley as a picture of some of his colleagues in the Cabinet ; but the cap is an admirable fit. A month later, speaking in his native borough of Blackburn, Lord Morley returned to his criticism of democracy :

' I was struck by a remark of the Archbishop of York, who said it was important to remember that democracy had no Divine right. That meant that democracy must show by the experience of the world, and our own country to begin with, that it is a good and efficient form of government. What does it depend on ? It depends upon the sense of public duty, the sense of responsibility, and the capability of the average citizen. . . . To return to a text I am never tired of talking about, it all depends upon people taking proper pains to form opinions rightly ; and those may be obtained by candid and fair discussion, interesting discussion, and, if you like, within bounds and reason, passionate and intrepid discussion. But it must be fair. That comes of education, and the Archbishop of York, on the occasion to which I have alluded, gave a definition of education which was that an educated man was the man who knew the difference between knowing and not knowing. . . . I say an educated man, among other qualifications, is a man who knows what is evidence, and when an assertion is proved and is not proved.'

All this is excellent, but it clearly implies that in the opinion of the greatest political thinker and writer of the day the methods of democracy are ignorant, impulsive, unfair, and violent. Lord Morley explicitly added that these faults were common to the politicians of all parties, to the glowing Liberal as well as to the glowing Conservative.

Mr. J. M. Robertson, one of the ablest members of a Government of clever men, differs from Lord Morley. He thinks that democracy and Liberalism are the same thing, or rather —for I should be sorry to misrepresent so candid a writer— that they ought to be, because the Liberal party is the best, or the only adequate, instrument which democracy will find. It is evident that the first portion of Mr. Robertson's book was written some years ago, as it is in several points corrected by the last part, which is obviously suggested by experience of the House of Commons and of office. For instance,

Mr. Robertson begins by sniffing contemptuously at academic culture and the education of the upper and middle classes. A wider knowledge of the world must have troubled him with some doubts of the wisdom of the cobbler when he goes beyond his last, for in his concluding chapters he asserts his belief that the heads will have quite as much to do with the future settlement of society as the hands. He laughs at the idea of production without profit, and, with the shrewdness of his country, declares that both labour and capital are dependent on the organising brain. This is a very different note from that of the earlier chapters : but it is merely the inconsistency into which every writer must fall who addresses himself to current politics at different periods. If Mr. Robertson had read his proofs more carefully he would not have been in such a hurry to tax Walter Bagehot with inconsistency. Mr. Robertson maintains that an average working man is quite as good a judge of politics as an average University man. It depends on what is meant by politics. On the hours, wages, and conditions of his own trade, and probably of many other trades, the working man is certainly a better judge than the University man. But Mr. Robertson cannot think that the hours and wages of labour constitute the sum total of a nation's politics. Mr. Robertson is too cultivated not to feel the force of Lord Morley's criticism. Government by ten million working men is government by a series of public meetings. No one is more perfectly aware than Mr. Robertson, who sits for a Tyneside constituency, that the discussion of political questions at public meetings is not 'can-' did and fair discussion,' and that the men who compose those meetings, however naturally intelligent, do not 'know what 'is evidence, and when an assertion is proved, and when it is 'not proved.' The University man, however conceited, however selfish, and however class-hardened, has at least been trained to find out the meaning of words, and he must know a good deal about the nature of evidence. There is, however, another ground on which Mr. Robertson believes that the Liberal party is a better instrument of democracy than the Conservative party—namely, that Liberals have an 'intellectual sympathy' with the working classes, which the Conservatives are too absorbed in their own sensualities to feel. Mr. Robertson admits that this intellectual sympathy is quite compatible with something like actual indifference to the sufferings of individual

neighbours. Instead of intellectual, I should call this attitude of mind, political sympathy, for it is little else than the profession of philanthropy which the modern politician finds indispensable on the platform. This intellectual sympathy is the cheapest of all sentiments, for it costs its professor nothing: it may be unaccompanied by a single act of kindness or charity to a single individual; it may even be the mask of the brutality of the millionaire sweater: and when unaccompanied by good deeds, it certainly is one of the most contemptible forms of human insincerity. Swift declared that he hated all classes, professions, tribes, and nations of men, and reserved all his love for individuals. Rousseau declared that he loved all mankind as brothers in misfortune. Yet Swift was extremely kind to the poor of his parish, to his servants, and to all his friends: while Rousseau abandoned his bastard on a door-step, and was always willing to borrow, or rather take money, from anybody who would give it to him. Rousseau stands for intellectual sympathy, and I gladly make a present of him to Mr. Robertson and the modern Liberal party. But I wish that Mr. Robertson were correct in his assumption that this 'intel-'lectual sympathy' is a monopoly of the Liberals. Conservative politicians are quite as ready to profess it, if only it may secure the patronage of democracy. Indeed, as is pointed out above, the Conservatives began to move along the line of State Socialism long before it occurred to the Liberals.

Democracy (or the ten or twenty million voters) has no party: it is king; and just as Charles, and James, and William, and the first three Georges, chose the ministers who would do what they wanted, so democracy will choose the party which will do, or which it thinks will do, what it wants. With royal impartiality democracy will choose from time to time Liberals, Conservatives, or Labour-Socialists, whoever will serve its turn, or whoever promises the most. For the moment democracy is choosing either Liberals or Conservatives, not because it dislikes the programme of the Labour-Socialists, but because it doubts their power of carrying it out: but in the long run it will come back to the Labour-Socialists, who indeed supply both Conservatives and Liberals with political ideas. Both Lord Morley and Mr. J. M. Robertson, the one at the end and the other at the beginning of his political career, deserve the greatest respect; but, like Matthew Arnold's Young Man

from the Country, they are not at the centre of the situation.

A far firmer grasp of the realities of the political situation is shown by Mr. Brougham Villiers in his 'Modern Democracy,' a book which, if I may be forgiven for saying so, would be twice as effective if it were half as long. Mr. Brougham Villiers is right in saying that the cardinal fact in the politics of the hour is the junction of the practical Trade-Unionists with the theoretical Socialists. It is impossible to deny the truth of his observation that the only body of political thought with which the Budget of 1909 and the Parliament Act and Old Age Pensions and the Insurance Act are compatible is Socialism. Trade-Unionists supply the votes; Socialists supply the ideas: and when once the two bodies understand one another, and join forces, they will be irresistible. All that Conservatives and Liberals can do is to filch ideas from the Socialists, and dress them up in the stock phrases of the last generation of politicians, which, to muddle-headed respectability, makes them look less dangerous. Soon the dressing-up will be superfluous, and then the occupation of Liberals and Conservatives will be gone.

'At present,' writes Mr. Villiers on p. 264, 'the struggle is between the growing organisation of labour and the established things of commercialism. Properly speaking, nothing that has no bearing on this struggle is at present politics at all. Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment, indeed, are vital in the first case and interesting in the second to the Irish and Welsh peoples for special reasons; but they do not greatly attract or genuinely alarm the forces of poverty and wealth. Liberalism may be enabled to deal with these questions in virtue of the stock-in-trade of popular goodwill it has earned by taxing undeveloped land and by limiting the Lords' veto. But the battle must be joined again on Guarantist issues if Liberalism is to retain that goodwill. Politics under democratic conditions must swing back to its old centre, the economic condition of the democracy.'

So, then, the one thing that matters is the struggle between poverty and wealth; and if Liberalism is to survive it must frankly take sides with poverty, and embrace Guarantism, which is the only thing that interests the democracy. What is Guarantism? It is an ugly word; and it stands for an ugly thing. Guarantism is a political system by which the forty-four or forty-five million men, women, and children in the United Kingdom are to

be guaranteed against the worry of insecurity at the expense of the one million men and women who pay income tax, death duties, and land taxes. This is not exaggeration or malicious invention ; it is the sober, literal expression of the demands of democracy. According to the evidence given by Sir Henry Primrose to Sir Charles Dilke's Committee, the number of people who pay income-tax are between one million and eleven hundred thousand. Of these three-fourths, or seven hundred and fifty thousand, claim abatement as having incomes of less than £700 a year. From people whose incomes range from £160 to £700 not much more is to be squeezed. The remaining quarter of a million citizens are to finance, not merely what used to be considered the needs of Government, the Army, Navy, Civil Service, primary education, and the administration of justice, but a gigantic superstructure of State charity, which, its author tells us with pride, will in five years amount to £40,000,000 a year, more than double the interest of the National Debt.* That the Labour-Socialist party demands the total abolition of all indirect taxation, that is, duties of customs and excise on articles of consumption, is not a matter of doubt. Mr. Brougham Villiers is not a fanatic or a dreamer ; on the contrary, his previous book on Socialism is praised by the 'Manchester Guardian' as 'an admirable 'historic interpretation of the economic and political forces 'which have gone to the making of present-day Socialism 'as exhibited in the Labour party.' With this certificate behind him, consider the following comment on the Budget of 1909 on p. 104 :—

'No Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer would ever have argued as Mr. Lloyd George did that *all* classes ought to bear any share in the new taxes or have imposed an extra 8*d*. in the pound on tobacco and raised the duty on spirits. The case of Labour—and it is unanswerable—is that as long as there are unearned incomes to tax there should be no taxes whatever on anything else. Labour would assert, and all that is really democratic in modern Radicalism would agree with this, that any tax that takes from men and women money needed to keep them or their families up to a standard of

* Mr. Lloyd George told us that in five years' time we should be spending on Old Age Pensions and Insurance £40,000,000, of which, roughly, £20,000,000 would be paid by the State and £20,000,000 by employers and contributors.

physical efficiency is an anti-social tax and should be abolished, not only in the interests of the taxpayers themselves, but of the community.'

Or take this sentence on p. 266 :

'It is important to the poor that the burden of taxes should be taken off their over-laden shoulders, and that direct should entirely displace indirect taxation.'

Here is another, and a very different, possibly a more authoritative, statement on the same point. Mr. Lloyd George's 'bonnets,' officially known as the Parliamentary Land Values Group, met at the House of Commons on July 31, 1912, when Sir Alfred Mond (one of Mr. Robertson's intellectual sympathisers) proposed the following resolution :—

'This meeting reaffirms its request to the Government to continue and develop the policy inaugurated by the Budget of 1909–10 by (1) making land values available for public needs ; (2) freeing industry from monopoly and undue burdens of taxation ; (3) completing the policy of Free Trade by (*a*) securing greater opportunities to produce in our own country by affording greater opportunities to use the land ; and (*b*) abolishing the duties that remain on the food of the people.

We further ask that this policy may be carried into effect by (1) hastening the completion of the valuation of all land, apart from improvements, provided for in the Budget of 1909–10 ; (2) making that valuation accessible to the public ; (3) empowering local authorities to levy rates on the basis of that valuation ; (4) levying a Budget tax on all land values to be applied (*a*) in providing a national fund to be allocated towards the cost of such services as education, poor relief, main roads, asylums, and police, thereby reducing the local rates ; and (*b*) in substitution of the duties on tea, sugar, cocoa, and other articles of food.'

We are now beginning to get an idea of how Guarantism is to be financed, and what its details are. In the 'Times' of the same day (July 31), under the heading 'New Labour Campaign,' the following announcement was made :

'Conferences have been arranged by the Independent Labour party and the Fabian Society in support of a demand that the whole of the next parliamentary session shall be devoted to "the consideration and passing of measures which will permanently raise the standard of life of the large masses of working people who are suffering from the evils of poverty." Among the demands made are a legal minimum wage, reduction of the hours of labour,

complete provision against sickness, a national minimum of child nurture, prevention of unemployment, healthy homes for all, and the abolition of the Poor Law.'

This is a striking confirmation of the main argument of Mr. Villiers' book, that Guarantism is the only thing the democracy cares about; and that the intellectual Socialists and the practical Trade-Unionists are laying their heads and their votes together to bring it about. Contingent spoil, speculative plunder, distant booty, benefits deferred, interest democracy not at all. Home Rule, Welsh Disestablishment, the Navy, our Foreign Policy, democracy regards as 'side-shows,' good enough for politicians to talk about, but not worth its serious attention. What the ten or twenty million voters, or the thirty million adults of both sexes, want, according to Mr. Villiers, are the following things:

1. Higher wages, with a guaranteed minimum for all.
2. Shorter hours.
3. The education, doctoring, and feeding of their children ('national minimum of child nurture').
4. Better houses at non-commercial rents.
5. All doctors' bills of adults to be paid, and hospital and sanatorium treatment to be provided.
6. Payment during unemployment, or provision of State relief works.
7. The abolition of workhouses.

It is a tolerably complete catalogue of wants: the only noticeable omissions are the provision of clothes and pocket-money; but that no doubt is an oversight, for the Sheppey Guardians were surcharged the other day for giving the children a penny a week pocket-money. Nearly all the other wants of life are mentioned. This is Guarantism, or the guaranteeing of the forty-five millions against the worries of life. If this list of wants drawn up by the Fabians and the Independent Labour party had been a table of the things which an honest and self-respecting father should get for himself and pay for, one would say it was admirable, almost the whole duty of the working man. But being instead a catalogue of things which are to be provided for the wage-earner by Government, and to be paid for by such of his fellow-citizens as have more than £160 a year, it becomes indistinguishable from a universal system of outdoor relief. A man who lives in a

house of which the rent is partly paid by others, whose children are taught, doctored, and, if necessary, fed* by taxes and rates collected from others, whose own doctors' bills and those of his wife are paid by others, who after seventy draws a pension which is paid by others, those others being his fellow-citizens, is as much the recipient of public charity as he who wears the workhouse dress. It is surely a stroke of humour on the part of the Fabians to talk of the abolition of the Poor Law, when the whole population is to be 'boarded out.' This may sound harsh language; but let it be remembered that it is the avowed policy of the Labour party, the Socialists, and of that large and influential body of Radicals who call themselves the Land Values Group, that the working classes shall pay no taxes at all. To be guaranteed against the worry of insecurity is a very nice thing, and a very natural desire, but the desire is not confined to those who work with their hands. Insecurity haunts the landowner with farms unlet, and falling rents, and single-tax campaigners hovering in the air. Insecurity creeps steadily on towards the shareholder, who is depressed by shrinking dividends and the unsaleability of what are facetiously called gilt-edged securities. But no one who has not seen it can realise the keen and pitiless persistency with which the demon of insecurity pursues the days of the professional man. Doctors miss patients; barristers and stockbrokers lose clients; and they dare not complain; they must studiously conceal the fact, for its publication would only accelerate their ruin. In 'The Master-Builder' there is a picture of the terror and loathing with which middle-aged and elderly professional men regard the generation that is rising behind them and treading on their heels. Nor is the picture overdrawn, for the worry of insecurity—except in the case of a few hundred very rich men and several thousand government officials quartered on the taxpayer—is, for the greater part of every man's life, the most universal and the most poignant of all the troubles to which he is subject. The desire to guarantee himself and his family against that anxiety is the strongest of the motives which impel a man to overcome his congenital indolence and incontinence. The struggle to secure that guarantee is the healthiest and the

* This year the London County Council fed 47,000 'necessitous' children.

noblest part of life, as success in securing it is the fitting crown of the man who has done his duty. But to be guaranteed against the common trials of humanity by a forced levy on other people is the last resource of a cowardly and corrupt citizen.

It may be answered that the contributions of the employees under the Insurance Act prove that the working-classes repudiate Guarantism; that they are more honest than their leaders; and that they have no intention of escaping their share of taxation. It may be so: let us hope it is so; but let us not be in too great a hurry to draw conclusions from an Act that has only been in operation a few weeks. Already there are indications that the business will end by the employers paying the employees' contributions. But even supposing that the employees submit to the deductions from wages, there will remain the annual charge of £20,000,000 to be found by the 'State,' which, according to Mr. Villiers and Sir Alfred Mond, and the Fabians and the Independent Labour party, means the million payers of income-tax. The charge is as much as the total charge for the present National Debt. What would have been said if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had honestly proposed to borrow £700,000,000 for State charity? And yet obviously it comes to the same thing whether you create a perpetual annuity of £21,000,000, or whether you borrow £700,000,000 at 3 per cent. Indeed, it is better to borrow, for you may pay off debt occasionally. Is it seriously proposed that one-thirtieth of the adult, or one forty-fifth of the whole, population should pay the total tax revenue of the country, which with Mr. Lloyd George's additions will shortly amount to £200,000,000 a year? People like Mr. Brougham Villiers and Sir Alfred Mond and the Labour-Socialist leaders must presumably be taken seriously, and they propose the abolition of indirect taxation. Are they willing to support an income-tax on all incomes down to £50 a year? Or a poll-tax on every householder and every lodger? Out of the present tax-revenue about 55 per cent is paid by direct, and about 45 per cent. by indirect, taxation, and it should be remembered that the million income-tax payers are large consumers of commodities, and that in this class the head of a household pays the indirect taxes of about five persons. Even the Chancellor of the Exchequer seems to be getting frightened at

his own handiwork, for the other day, when confronted by some popularity-hunting Tories who wanted to reduce the tea-duties because they so loved the poor, he fell to talking of the Roman plebs, and a parasite democracy. How to finance an extravagant King and his hungry courtiers has always been the difficulty of English Governments. But the mistresses of the Stuarts and the political pensioners of the Guelphs were a flea-bite to the demands of Guarantism.

Mr. J. M. Robertson has a Scotsman's sturdy confidence in brains. He believes that the heads will have quite as much to say to the industrial re-arrangement as the hands. His observation is correct that labour and capital are equally helpless without the organising brain. He is right in saying that competition is more efficient than co-operation, and that the majority of co-operative schemes have failed from the unwillingness of the working-classes to obey and to remunerate adequately a clever manager. Fluid capital flows through passive shareholders into the hands of the adminstrative or financial genius, who holds the key of the industrial situation, but who hardly ever begins as a capitalist. From a member of a Radical Government this tribute to individualism is ' rare ' and refreshing.' Mr. Robertson deals quite disrespectfully with the economic theories of the writers in the ' New Age,' and of Collectivists generally, as the following passages show :

' It may be taken as reasonably certain that, whatever is in store for us, the " heads " as well as the " hands " will play their part in deciding the evolution. The process will not be one either of putting the heads in gaol and supplanting them by committees of workers who will successfully fill their place, or of keeping them at their posts with pistols held to their heads. On neither plan could industry be long carried on. Every conception of a social change in which mere coercion rectifies existing inequality is dismissible as a dream either of envy and ignorance or of puerile optimism.

' " Production for profit " will assuredly continue for centuries, profit being not merely the condition of the furnishing of fluid capital but the test of industrial efficiency. Fluid capital is about as far from the stage of collective management as the tides.'

All this is the soundest of common sense : can we be sure that it is true as a prophecy ? Unfortunately, the compatriots of Adam Smith will write, like the master, as if there were a Scotsman inside every man. I am not one of those who

believe that history repeats itself ; I appreciate Lord Morley's warning against misleading historical parallels. But though I am not afraid of another French Revolution like that of 1789, I do believe in the persistence of certain characteristics in certain forms of government—else were all history useless compilation. History testifies unmistakably and unanimously to the passion of democracies for incompetence. There is nothing democracy dislikes and suspects so heartily as technical efficiency, particularly when it is independent of the popular vote. Thus the judges are spoken of to-day by the Labour party as 'antiquated fossils,' and a demagogue Home Secretary has described them, in effect, as the partisan tools of capitalism. M. Émile Faguet's book on 'The Cult of Incompetence,' so admirably translated, is of course written about democracy in France, where the system of partisan appointments to the bench and to the Civil Service is practised more shamelessly than it is as yet in this country. But there is much, very much, in this little book which we might lay to heart as a warning, and something that is perfectly applicable to the present state of parties in this country. The attack of the Radicals, led by Sir John Brunner, Sir Charles Henry, and Mr. Primrose, 'intellectual sympathisers' with the proletariat, on Lord Loreburn with regard to the appointment of magistrates, was a very ominous portent. M. Faguet indeed condemns every partisan as morally incompetent to make laws for all, which is true, but a counsel of perfection. Epigrammatic brevity is not always the condensation of sciolism, as the following description of democratic legislation proves :

> 'The law does not control and restrain the passions of the populace. Legislation becomes little more than an expression of their frenzy, a series of party measures levelled by one faction against the other. The introduction of a bill is a challenge ; the passing of an Act is a victory ; definitions which at once damn the legislator and convict the system.'

The recent wholesale creation of officials by the Government, and the appointment of partisans to the posts without regard to their technical efficiency ; the withdrawal of the conduct of these officials, as far as possible, from the jurisdiction of the courts of law ; the attempt, happily not yet successful, to reduce the medical practitioner to the status of a govern-

ment servant ; all point in the same direction. The one object of democracy is to drag the most competent and industrious individuals down to the level of the laziest and the least competent. How should it be otherwise? Numbers are supreme, and the majority are always less competent and less industrious than the minority. Moreover, the masses have been taught by their Government that nothing is easier than to change an old law which they dislike, or to mould a new law to their fancy. As M. Faguet says, ' the people wish to do everything ' themselves, and think that they can do everything themselves.' With all deference to Mr. J. M. Robertson—who since he has taken a seat on the Front Bench has surely, like Mr. John Burns, become an aristocrat—I do not believe that the individual organiser will be employed and paid by democracy until rueful experience has proved his indispensability. The experiment of the collectivist management of industry will be tried, though how long it will last, through ' what varieties ' of untried being ' society may have to pass before technical and moral competence are reseated in authority, it is impossible to predict.

Leaving out for the moment the forty Irish members, democracy will have the choice of three servants, the Liberal, the Unionist and the Labour-Socialist parties. Which will democracy choose ? Obviously that which it thinks will be most willing and apt to execute its orders. And which will that be ? If the Unionists were really a Conservative party, they ought to be eliminated from the list, for they would recognise that at the present juncture the true function of a Conservative party is to criticise and resist, not to obey, the impulses of democracy. The frank and bold adoption of this Conservative attitude is more likely to reseat the Unionists in power than the infatuated and dishonest endeavour to outbid the Liberals and the Socialists. But the politicians do not think so ; they smile at the idea of going to the country with a negative : we must offer something, say they, or we shall be rejected ; they demand of the machine a cry. It never seems to occur to the machine or its candidates that to offer the country social peace and firm and efficient government might turn out to be the best of all cries. No ; there must be a housing scheme ; and an abolition of the poor-law scheme ; and a minimum-wage scheme ; and various other quackeries stolen from the

pharmacopœia of the Socialists ; to say nothing of Tariff Reform, which the Unionists of Manchester seem to have some difficulty in swallowing. So that the Unionist party will be quite as keen and complaisant a competitor for the patronage of democracy as the Liberal and Labour-Socialist parties. And so great will be the irritation inevitably caused by the Insurance Act in the first years of its operation that it is more than probable that democracy will risk Tariff Reform and throw its handkerchief to the Unionists in 1915. But in the present condition of England a Unionist Government cannot be more than an interlude. For the next ten or fifteen years the probability is that democracy will employ the Liberal party to do its work, partly because it is accustomed to their names and catchwords, and partly because the Labour-Socialist leaders are shrewd enough to know that the country is not yet ripe for their own rule. And the Liberal party will be a willing and obedient servant, so long as there is any money to be wrung from the owners of land. But as soon as the last penny has been squeezed out of the landlords the turn of the shareholders and the financiers will come. The Liberal party will then split, a large proportion joining what is now called the Unionist party, and the residue going over to the Socialists. It is possible that this split may be followed by a reaction which will give power to that conservative element which exists in all classes ; but it is also possible that the ten or twenty million voters living on weekly and monthly wages will choose a Labour-Socialist Government ; and if in accordance with the programme all indirect taxation is abolished, an income-tax rising to 5*s.* in the pound will be necessary to run the State. Let those who think the last figure an exaggeration consider the following calculation. The cost of State pensions and insurance will in a few years' time, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, amount to £40,000,000, as compared with £15,000,000 in the present year, or an additional expenditure of £25,000,000 a year. The abolition of indirect taxation, i.e. of duties of customs and excise, if completely carried out, means a loss of £71,000,000 of revenue, which must be transferred to the income-tax. These two sums amount to £96,000,000. In addition there are housing schemes, and land-purchase schemes, and reform of the Poor Law, advocated by Unionists as warmly as by Liberals and Socialists, while we must also look forward

to a probable increased expenditure upon the army and navy. If the future additional revenue necessary to finance State Socialism without indirect taxation be put at £120,000,000, there will not be much exaggeration. The present income-tax produces about £44,000,000. Therefore if we are to raise an additional sum of £120,000,000 from the income-tax, or £164,000,000 altogether, the existing rates of the tax would have to be roughly quadrupled ; for it must be remembered that as the rate rises the tax becomes relatively less productive. It may be answered that the abolition of indirect taxation is impossible, that the temperance party would never permit the complete abolition of duties on beer and spirits, and that even the Socialists would insist on retaining the duties on such luxuries of the rich as champagne and motor-cars. The latter consideration may be readily admitted, but it is unimportant. Indirect taxation confined to the luxuries of the rich will never produce any very considerable revenue. The former consideration is uncertain. The modern Socialist has a very different outlook on life from the old type of working-man Radical, who generally drew his inspiration from the nonconformist pulpit, and it is quite conceivable that the Socialists might appeal to the electors with a proposal to abolish the duties on the poor man's 'beer and baccy.' Things are moving fast. If in 1895 a wise man had said : within fifteen years you will see the House of Lords destroyed, gratuitous State pensions to persons over seventy, and the entire working-class population insured by contributions, two-thirds (or the whole) of which are paid by the classes above them, he would have been told that he was mad, or at best a presumptuous pessimist. It is of course possible that the honesty and manliness of Great Britain may revolt against the dishonesty of the politicians, and insist on retaining the present system of taxation, or agree to extend the income-tax downwards to £50 a year. But when one million citizens with accumulated property lie at the mercy of ten or twenty million citizens with no property but their wages, the temptation to poor fallible human nature is great. Even the most incorrigible optimist must admit that there is serious danger.

A Labour-Socialist Government and an income-tax of 5*s.* in the pound will not ruin England. Australia and New Zealand are governed by the Labour-Socialists, and they are

not ruined, though their prosperity is hampered. The prosperity of England would be even more hampered, for it depends much more on the presence of rich and educated men, living in our midst, attracting to our country the wealth of other nations, and stimulating by their brain-power and by their control over large masses of capital the creation of fresh wealth. The young men of this class, when threatened with taxation on a vindictive scale, will realise whatever they can and depart to Uganda or Rhodesia or Vancouver Island; while those of us who have turned the cape of forty, but are neither political lawyers, nor journalists, nor trade-union secretaries, will retire to cultivate our gardens. Who shall say that life in England will not then be supportable? Such an England under a Labour-Socialist Government, with an income tax of 5s. in the pound, will certainly not be the England that under Chatham conquered Canada and India, that under Pitt and his successors beat Napoleon, or that under Beaconsfield claimed a decisive voice in the council of Europe. But what then? Nothing is more difficult than to say in what the happiness of the individual citizen consists. Two centuries ago Holland was as great a power as England. Who shall say whether the Dutch burgher of the seventeenth century was more or less happy than the Dutch burgher of to-day? I once read to a cultivated and intelligent Radical friend (with goods laid up) a famous passage from a speech of Pericles, who appealed to the people of Athens to sacrifice material comfort to external power and glory. Slowly my Radical friend made answer: 'Well, I do not agree 'with Pericles; I should be just as happy were Great Britain 'reduced to the international position of Holland or of Switzer-'land.' My friend had the courage of his opinion; but was he right? Does mere material prosperity necessarily produce happiness? That England is to-day, as Mr. J. M. Robertson affirms, happier and more contented than she was twenty years ago is a very doubtful proposition. That the material elements of happiness are present in greater abundance than ever before is undeniable, but concurrently with this growth in material prosperity there has been a growth in the spirit of envy and class hatred, and these are not qualities that produce happiness—they produce democratic politicians.

ARTHUR A. BAUMANN.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

1. **Congressional Record, Sixty-second Congress, Second Session.** Government Printing Office. Washington. 1912.
2. **The United States Steel Corporation.** Hearings before the Committee on Investigation of the United States Steel Corporation. Government Printing Office. Washington. 1912.

NOT since the second election of Lincoln in 1864 has there been a presidential contest in the United States of greater world-wide interest or a political struggle more worth watching than the election which will take place on November 5. Nor since Lincoln's time has there been an election campaign so long drawn out, characterised by so many new and significant features, or followed with such close and continuous attention by the American people. Six parties—the Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Prohibitionist, and two distinct groups of Socialists—have presidential and congressional candidates in the field. This multiplicity of candidates, and of national and state platforms, has made the election a little difficult to follow from a distance, despite the unusual amount of attention which has been given to the campaign in the cablegrams and the letters by mail of the correspondents of London and provincial newspapers in Washington and New York. The numerous direct primaries—primaries at which electors indicate their preferences for the presidential candidates of their parties—have also added to the difficulties of students of American politics who have been watching this year's election at long range. Even for those on the spot the introduction of the new machinery of direct primaries has brought with it some difficulty; for 1912 is the first year in which this machinery has come into service, and as there is no uniformity in the direct primary laws, and as they have been enacted by less than half of the state legislatures, close attention has been needed to follow their working, and to appraise their significance.

Another factor that has added to the difficulty of following this election is the position of the American daily press.

Mr. Roosevelt and the insurgent or Progressive Republicans have here and there in the large cities some newspapers that are supporting their cause. In Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Chicago and San Francisco various newspapers which were formerly Republican in politics have vigorously and whole-heartedly thrown themselves into the present movement against the Republican party. They protest against the manner in which that party has been controlled and managed for many years past, especially since the election of McKinley as President in 1896, when supreme control passed into the hands of the late Senator Hanna of Ohio, the first political boss who openly appeared as the avowed representative of the big business interests. But nine out of ten of the daily newspapers in all the large cities are thirled either to the old Republican or to the Democratic party.

Except to some extent on the question of the tariff, there is little difference between the Taft Republicans and the Democrats, and no well-marked or appreciable difference between the state bosses of the Republican party and those of the Democratic party. Neither of these two sets of bosses, to use an American colloquialism, are 'in politics for their health,' or for the advancement of any political principles. They are in it for what, directly or indirectly, can be made out of politics as a pursuit; and the antagonism of the two sets of bosses is seldom permitted to endanger the hold which each set keeps on the machinery of the two political parties.

Both political parties, alike in federal and state politics, are closely allied with the big business interests that since the middle eighties of last century have profited so enormously from the power they exercise in politics. But since 1897—when McKinley began his first term as President—the alliance of the big business interests with the Republican party in federal politics has necessarily been much closer than with the Democratic party; because from 1897 to 1911 the Republicans have been continuously in control of the administration and of both Senate and House of Representatives. They have consequently been in a position to guarantee ample returns in the way of tariff and other legislation in return for contributions to their campaign funds.

In consequence of this alliance, and with the assistance of Hanna, who came on the scene in 1896 and received a seat in

the Senate, the big business interests have dictated who was to be President and who Vice-President; who was to hold this or that portfolio in the presidential Cabinet; who was to be senator from this or that state in which the Republicans were in control of the legislature and the local political machine. Similarly they have had their part in the choice of Speaker for the House of Representatives, and in the nominations of the more important committees of those state legislatures which were controlled by Republicans. As regards legislation, the big business interests held high carnival at Washington in 1897, when the Dingley tariff was enacted, and again in the summer of 1909, when President Taft cynically repudiated the pledges of the National Convention of 1908 and his own electoral platform, and accepted the Payne-Aldrich tariff. But these carnivals at Washington have been by no means confined to periods when the Republicans were in control of the administration and of Congress. In 1894, when the Wilson tariff was enacted, the big business interests, through their influence with a group of Democratic senators, openly thwarted Cleveland and the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. Cleveland's stinging denunciation of what he described as 'the communism of pelf' is still remembered, but there is little ground for thinking that, if the Democrats had been in power from 1897 to 1912, the connexion of the big business interests with them would have been any less close than it has been with the Republicans.

These business interests have no politics in the English acceptance of the term; but they are continuously busy with politics, not only at Washington, but in the state legislatures as well. From behind the scenes they put out large sums of money to advance their particular ends, and obtain from these investments returns of a hundred or a thousand per cent. Seven-tenths at least of the colossal fortunes now in the possession of men attached to these interests are directly due to political privileges bestowed upon them by Congress or by the state legislatures. The big business interests know nothing of party lines, except that they keep closest to the party that happens to be in power at Washington or at the state capitols where they are pushing their schemes. They are seldom, either as individuals or as groups, concerned with any of

the political principles to which the bosses, and the organs in the press of the two political parties, at each succeeding presidential, congressional, and state election seek to persuade the voters that these parties are attached. At the same time, those interests that depend directly upon the tariff are inclined towards the Republicans, because from the experience of half a century they know that the Republican party is a little more reliable on the question of protection to manufacturers than the Democratic party. There has been a similar leaning towards the Republicans on the part of the express companies, which in the United States undertake at extortionate rates the services that are discharged in England through the parcels post. Not long ago both of the Republican senators from New York were representatives of these great and powerful transport monopolies, and the Republican party in New York state and federal politics was bossed by the president of one of these express companies. But these big business interests, at least since 1894, when Cleveland was unsuccessfully wrestling with them in the popular interest, have been cynical in their proclamations that they use both political parties and that they have subscribed to the campaign funds of both. It is equally notorious that many Democratic newspapers are as much under the control—direct or indirect —of big business interests of one kind or another as are many of the newspapers which support President Taft and the old guard of the Republican party.

From its inception in 1907 the insurgent movement within the Republican party has threatened both the old political parties. Primarily, no doubt, the movement is aimed at the dislodgment of the old guard of the Republican party from state as well as from federal politics. But if any success is to attend this movement it must draw support from electors who have hitherto been of the Democratic party as well as from those who have hitherto voted with the Republicans. It thus comes about that the Progressives have had to encounter the bitter opposition of both Republican and Democratic newspapers. Indeed no presidential candidate ever before encountered opposition from so many daily newspapers as opposed Mr. Roosevelt from February until the national convention of the Republican party was held in June. In 1896, when Mr. Bryan was the candi-

date of the Democratic party and committed that party to the free coinage of silver, he encountered the opposition, not only of all the Republican newspapers, but also of a large number of Democratic newspapers that broke away from the official programme of the Democrats, and supported the gold standard. But the battery of newspapers—Democratic and Republican—then trained on Mr. Bryan was not nearly so large as that directed against Mr. Roosevelt during the first half of the presidential campaign of 1912. The Democratic newspapers, in fact, were so absorbed in their opposition to Mr. Roosevelt until within two weeks of the national convention of the Democratic party at Baltimore, at which Governors Wilson of New Jersey, and Marshall of Indiana were adopted as the candidates, that from a reading of the daily newspapers one might have concluded that the only contest going on was between President Taft and Mr. Roosevelt for the nomination of the Republican national convention at Chicago.

All this newspaper hostility was of little or no avail against Mr. Roosevelt in the states with direct primary laws—the states in which electors were afforded an opportunity of choosing among the candidates for nomination by their respective parties. Mr. Roosevelt, with practically no political organisation to support him in these direct primary states, and with nine out of ten of the daily newspapers all over the country in hostility to him, carried all before him at the primaries. It will be recalled that he even defeated Mr. Taft in Ohio, the President's home state, and the state in which the late Senator Hanna first developed the great power that he afterwards exercised in national politics and at Washington.

These sweeping successes of Mr. Roosevelt which preceded the national convention of the Republican party at Chicago—a convention made memorable by the reckless audacity of Mr. Taft's supporters and of the old guard of the Republican party—suggest that the editorial pages of the daily newspapers nowadays count for little or nothing in a political campaign. Three years ago, when the fraudulent revision of the tariff was occupying public attention, and when Mr. Taft was about to make the initial and most damaging blunder of his singularly ill-starred career as President, the daily press was as unanimous in its appeals to him not to identify himself and the Republican party with the reactionary group in the Senate led by

Mr. Aldrich of Rhode Island, and Mr. Lodge of Massachusetts, as it was from February to June last in its opposition to Mr. Roosevelt. But all the newspaper appeals to Mr. Taft in the summer of 1909, at the great crisis of his career at the White House, were of no avail. He then threw in his lot with the representatives of the big business interests in the Senate and permitted Senators Aldrich and Lodge to frame the tariff, after secret conferences with the manufacturers; to load it to the water's edge with increases in duties and with 'jokers' for the gain of cotton and silk manufacturers and the iron and steel interests; and to re-enact Schedule K—the notorious woollen schedule.

Not the slightest attention was then paid by the old guard of the Republican party or by President Taft to the continuous appeals of the Republican newspapers not to jeopardise the future of the party by a bogus revision of the Dingley Act of 1897. The press counted for nothing at that crisis in the Republican party. It counted for nothing, or next to nothing, in the early and critical stages of the intensely personal struggle between Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt that preceded the Republican national convention; and it would seem that its influence—at any rate the influence of the editorial pages—is to-day as much threatened by the revolt within the Republican party as is the power of the men who through their subserviency to the big business interests have thriven so well and so long as the bosses of the party in state and national politics.

Rightly or wrongly, the popular conviction seems to be that a large part of the daily press is in close connexion with the big business interests that are using both the old political parties for their own gain and aggrandisement. Still the fact that many of the newspapers all over the country are opposing Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressives tends to a confusion or a misrepresentation of the issues of the campaign. It also adds to the difficulty of forecasting the result of the election in those states where there are no direct primary laws, and no preliminary elections. In the states where there were direct primaries it is not conceivable that Mr. Taft can do any better or even as well on November 5 as he did in April and May; for Mr. Roosevelt is likely to poll a larger and not a smaller vote as the presidential candidate of the Progressives than he polled at the primaries.

This statement is justified by the popular demonstrations in Mr. Roosevelt's favour that have been made in the states which have no direct primaries since he was nominated at the national convention of the Progressive party in August. Outside the south, where the Democrats are always in control, most of the states in which there are no direct primaries are boss-ridden when they are controlled by the Republican party. The delegations from these states to the Republican national convention at Chicago in June were elected by the old party machinery and the old boss methods; and the Republican newspapers in these states supported the old guard of the Republican party. But neither the bosses nor the newspapers have been able to stay the popular revolt within the Republican party, and the outlook for Mr. Taft in these states is not much better than it is in the states in which he was defeated at the primary elections.

Most of the activity in the constituencies in the weeks that intervened between the Chicago and the Baltimore conventions in June and the beginning of that stage of the campaign, when appeal on behalf of the candidates and of the national platforms is made to the electors, was in the interest of Mr. Roosevelt and the National Progressive party. The new party had to create its organisation and machinery in the wards of the cities and the polling areas of the congressional districts. Until the Chicago convention, the Progressives were of the Republican party, and they had availed themselves of its machinery, which, while not so old as that of the Democratic party, is of two generations' standing and service.

Unlike the older parties, the Progressives could not suspend campaign activities during the heat of July and August. In some of the states in which there are no direct primaries the Progressives were, as a matter of fact, not permitted to let the popular campaign stand over until the cooler evenings of September. They were compelled to hold popular meetings as well as to busy themselves with the creation of local party machinery, because there were in these states many sporadic revolts within the Republican party immediately after the national conventions, and with these revolts there came the demand, that could not go unheeded, that the revolters should be brought into line with the progressive movement that since February has centred about Mr. Roosevelt.

Writing on the eve of the final appeal to the electors—twenty-five million men in the Union and a million and a half women in the six states of Wyoming, Idaho, Colorado, Utah, Washington and California—writing before the mass meetings and demonstrations that mark the last four weeks of a presidential campaign, it seems that the election must narrow itself down to a contest between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Taft's chances of re-election would have been no better if the contest had been only between him and Governor Wilson ; for it must be remembered that it was Mr. Taft's tariff policy and his subserviency to the high protectionist contingent of the big business interests that were popularly repudiated and condemned at the congressional elections in November 1910. The Democrats then, after being continuously in a minority from 1897 to 1911, obtained a majority of seventy in the House of Representatives, and the old guard of the Republican party lost its control of the Senate as a result of the popular uprising in the state elections against the Payne-Aldrich Act and its enormities. Since then nearly every action of Mr. Taft's, every development at Washington, and every step taken by the old guard of the Republican party, have tended to weaken the slender hold that Mr. Taft and the old Republican party had on the country at the congressional elections two years ago. If Mr. Taft had been continuously immured in the White House since he took possession there on March 4, 1909, if he had been denied the privileges of visitors and of receiving newspapers and communications from outside, he could not have more completely failed to realise the great change in political thought which has swept over the United States since the insurgent movement first manifested itself five years ago.

It is possible that Mr. Taft might have achieved a humdrum success as President, and gone into retirement with a reputation on a par with that of Harrison or McKinley, had his four years' term been from 1897 to 1901—the period of McKinley's presidency. This was the heyday of the Republican party, when the Democratic party was distrusted on account of its failures of 1894 and was divided and demoralised as the result of its free silver adventure of 1896. This was the period when the Republican party carried the presidential and congressional elections on the platform of the full dinner-pail, by persuading

factory workpeople in the Atlantic coast states from Pennsylvania to Maine and in the states of the middle west that the Democrats and the Wilson tariff of 1894 were wholly and solely responsible for the financial and industrial depression of the years from 1893 to 1896 ; and that unless the Republicans were restored to power, and allowed to re-enact high protective duties, the working people would go short of food, if they did not find themselves on the tramp or at the poorhouse.

McKinley's success at the election of 1896 was largely due to the full dinner-pail campaign. The campaign was splendidly staged by Hanna, and generously supported by the contributions of the protectionist contingent of the big business interests, and, in the years that followed, government through the Republican party by the big business interests, of whose activity the existing tariff is the most prominent monument, was not sufficiently realised or understood to arouse popular questionings which might jeopardise the hold of that party on Congress and on the government. This, it will also be recalled, was the period of the Cuban war, which came, most conveniently for the Republican party, between the enactment of the Dingley tariff—the highest tariff until then on the statute book—in the extra session of 1897 and the congressional elections in 1898. The excitement of the war effectually put the tariff into the background of popular memory, and saved the Republican party from a defeat like that which followed the enactment of the McKinley tariff in the autumn of 1890.

During these four years (1897–1901), and also during the first six years of Mr. Roosevelt's seven years as President, it seemed as though the United States government were the permanent and undisputed possession of the Republican party and of the big business interests. But with the era of great industrial trusts that began when the United States Steel Corporation was organised in 1901, and with the consequent almost general deposition of the individual manufacturer in favour of the promoter and the financier of trusts, the tariff contingent of the big business interests began to overplay the game. The tariff of 1897, which the protected manufacturers obtained in return for the usual contributions to the campaign funds of the Republican party, was as admirably adapted to the overplaying of the game against the consumer as it was to enabling the individual manufacturers to exact an enormous

price for their concerns from the financiers who were promoting the trusts into which these undertakings were merged.

As one enlightening result of the long and detailed investigation of the organisation and economy of the Steel Trust by the Stanley Committee during the sessions of Congress of 1911–12, it is now known, from the minutes of the directors of the trust, that the beginnings of the insurgent movement within the Republican party were directly due to a conflict between primary and secondary manufacturers in the iron and steel industry over the prices which the latter were to pay for their raw material. The parties to the conflict were the late Mr. Bope, in 1906 sales agent for the Carnegie Steel Company—a subsidiary company of the Steel Trust—and the manufacturers of farm machinery in Ohio, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin. The dispute arose over the price at which these manufacturers, who were members of a national trade association, were to obtain steel bars. Mr. Bope controlled these prices, and at the time the question came to a head the manufacturers were being pushed in the market by the International Harvester Company, a second cousin of the Steel Trust.

The manufacturers of farm machinery were forced to buy from the Steel Trust if they were to continue in business and not abandon the field to the Harvester Trust ; and appeals to Mr. Bope for easier terms were made early in 1906. At first Mr. Bope—confident that the manufacturers could neither obtain their supplies elsewhere in the United States, nor import them under the high duties of the Dingley Act—would make no concessions. The manufacturers could take the steel bars on Mr. Bope's terms or they could go without. Towards the end of March, however, Mr. Bope eased a little in his attitude towards these customers of the Steel Trust, and presented a report at the weekly meeting of the directors on April 2, in which he explained his reasons for the change of attitude and the concessions he was disposed to make to the agricultural implement manufacturers :

> When I reported last week on the subject of bars that I was in favour of standing pat with the agricultural people, I did not quite understand the situation. It has since developed that their request was made principally on account of the competition of the International Harvester Trust Company, which has become so serious

as to threaten the existence of a good many of the smaller agricultural concerns. They (the Harvester Company) are extending their operations to almost everything the farmer needs. They could now manufacture all the binders needed in this country, and they are making other lines of agricultural machinery, and have recently gone into the manufacture of wagons. They turned out 12,000 wagons last year; have doubled capacity for this year; and next year expect to turn out about 100,000. They make all their own steel, and all this tonnage has been taken away from the steel manufacturers. After carefully considering the matter, we decided we could not grant the price they (the agricultural implement manufacturers) asked for—$1.30, but we decided that we would make them a price of $1.40. We got together on Saturday; and while we did not vote a certain price, we came to the understanding we would reduce the price to the agricultural and wagon manufacturers only for fifteen days, and those who do not come in by that time will have to pay $1.50. The matter was put up to the committee who waited upon us; and they claimed to be very indignant, and they said they were going to call a meeting in Chicago and start a tariff agitation among the farmers against the Steel Trust. [Hearings before the Committee on Investigation of the United States Steel Corporation, House of Representatives, Bulletin No. 53. Part II. 4078.]

Most of the information elicited by the Stanley Committee was of financial, economic and sociological interest, as distinct from political significance. From the standpoint of the economist the revelation of most permanent value was the additional proof that the high duties in American tariffs since the seventies have nowadays no relation to the wages paid at American steel plants, or to the hours of labour and general condition of wage-earners in the iron and steel industry. There were some revelations of political significance, such as those concerning the contributions of the Steel Trust to the Republican national campaign fund of 1904—the year of Mr. Roosevelt's election—and concerning a contribution of three thousand dollars made by the trust in January 1911 to a protectionist organisation in Philadelphia, which waged a propaganda to prevent President Taft's plan for a permanent tariff commission from receiving the endorsement of the Republican national convention in Chicago last June.

None of these political revelations, however, has more interest in connexion with the present electoral campaign than Mr. Bope's statement of the circumstances under which the independent manufacturers of farm implements were

impelled to political action against the high duties of the iron and steel schedules. It was known in 1907 that the revolt against the tariff came not from the general consumer, from the man who buys goods over a counter, who is unorganised and who can effectually express himself only at elections; but that it was a movement of manufacturers engaged in the secondary stages of the iron and steel industry, who, although protected themselves, were goaded into revolt because they were threatened both in their home and in their foreign trade by the high prices they were compelled to pay under the Dingley tariff for their raw material.

The first outcome of this movement was the tariff revision pledge embodied in the national platform of the Republican party in 1908. This was followed by the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich tariff; and it was the failure of that tariff to give effect to the revision pledge which led to the humiliating personal conflict between Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt, and finally to the organisation of the National Progressive party. For fuller particulars the reader may be referred to an article appearing in these pages in 1909.* It was not, however, until the Stanley Committee was in possession of the minute books of the Steel Corporation that there was documentary evidence that the division within the Republican party had its origin in April 1906, as a direct result of the overplaying of the game by a sales agent of the most powerful of the great industrial aggregations that since 1897 have been protected from all outside competition by the high duties of the Dingley tariff.

It has already been stated that the agricultural implement manufacturers of the middle western states were organised in a national association. The negotiations with Mr. Bope were conducted by a committee of this association. The manufacturers were accordingly in a position to make good the threat that Mr. Bope reported to the directors of the Steel Trust on April 2, 1906. The tariff agitation was promptly started in the middle west. Republican senators and congress-men from these states identified themselves with it. The time was opportune for other reasons than that which had goaded the implement manufacturers into action, and out of this agitation was developed the insurgent movement in the

* *Edinburgh Review*, No. 427. Pp. 70–93.

Republican party at Washington. An unsuccessful appeal was made to President Roosevelt to use his influence to secure an immediate revision of the iron and steel schedules of the tariff. There was much discussion of these schedules at Washington between 1906 and 1908. It was at this time that the stand-pat group of Republicans in the House and the Senate came into evidence—the group that insisted that there was nothing wrong with any of the schedules of the Dingley tariff. This group was sufficiently strong to prevent reform, and all that resulted from the agitation in the sessions of 1906, 1907, and 1908 was a concession, grudgingly made, that the tariff question should be re-opened at the national convention of 1908, and that a pledge should be embodied in the platform committing the Republican party to tariff revision.*

Mr. Roosevelt, who to-day is at the head of the Progressive movement, gave little or no help to this agitation within the Republican party for a revision of the iron and steel schedules. He had then no desire to antagonise the protectionist contingent of the big business interests, and passed tariff revision on as a legacy to Mr. Taft. The insurgent movement, which was numerically stronger at Washington in the extra session of 1909—the first session under the new administration—as a result of the congressional and state elections of 1908, was also a legacy that Mr. Taft inherited from Mr. Roosevelt. This is the movement that has been Mr. Taft's undoing. He either never understood it and the numerous causes which brought it into existence, and which have since given it increasing strength, or, like the old guard of the Republican party in the House and Senate, he imagined that by emphasising party regularity it could be over-ridden and made of no account.

The result has been that, since the day that Congress convened an extra session in May 1909 to revise the Dingley tariff, there has been a continuous antagonism between the President and the insurgent Republicans in the House and Senate who come from the middle west and western states. Even before the opening day of this session Mr. Taft was compelled to define his position towards the stand-patters on the one hand

---

* *Edinburgh Review*, No. 430. Pp. 269–302.

and the insurgents on the other. The latter were determined that Mr. Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, should not again be chosen as Speaker of the House of Representatives. Dislike and distrust of Mr. Cannon extended far beyond the ranks of the insurgents in Congress. There are many newspapers to-day supporting Mr. Taft against the Progressives, which would have welcomed the defeat of Mr. Cannon at the elections of 1908. But in May 1909 Mr. Taft threw all his great influence as President on the side of Mr. Cannon, and, with the aid of a few Democrats of the Tammany school from New York state, secured his re-election as Speaker. The old rules which entrusted the Speaker with such enormous power were also re-adopted; and the old guard of the Republican party in Congress triumphed over the insurgents.

A little later in the same session there was an open breach between Mr. Taft and insurgent Republicans in the Senate. These senators ceased to go to the White House, and were deprived of the patronage which is regarded as belonging to the members of the majority party in the Senate. Three months before the Payne-Aldrich bill, described by one of the insurgent senators as 'as much a hoax as Dr. Cook's discovery of the 'North Pole,' was ready for the signature of the President, Mr. Taft had ranged himself on the side of the old guard and the big business group of Republican senators. The new tariff in most of its important details, in all that counted at the congressional elections in 1910, had been framed by the three dominant senators of this group—Messrs. Aldrich, Lodge and Smoot—in the reactionary spirit, and by the methods that were described from official sources in these pages in 1911.* It was at this time that the Republican newspapers all over the country, in view of the congressional elections due in November 1910, appealed to Mr. Taft to insist that, in the revision that was then nearing its end, the Republican party should not repudiate the tariff pledge of its national platform, and that he should give his approval to no bill that did not effect a reduction of the high duties of the Dingley tariff.

Many duties, and in particular some of those on cottons, silks and chemicals, were actually made more protective by the

---

* *Edinburgh Review*, No. 438. Pp. 397–419.

Payne-Aldrich bill. The most flagrant outrage of all Republican tariffs since 1862, the woollen schedule, with duties as high as two hundred and fifteen per cent., was also re-embodied in the bill without a single reduction of value to the consumer, notwithstanding the fact that the public hearings before the committee of ways and means of the House of Representatives on December 1, 1908, had brought to light documentary proofs of one of the worst examples of intrigue and rapacity that has ever been revealed in the sordid history of tariff making at Washington.*

The revision of the tariff at this time was the greatest opportunity that had come or was likely to come to Mr. Taft during his four years as President. Had he realised how widely the country sympathised with the insurgent Republicans in their ineffective efforts to secure a *bona-fide* revision which might reduce the high cost of living, and how intolerant it was of the little group of Republicans in the Senate who were using their power with astonishing audacity on behalf of the big business interests, and in particular of the woollen, cotton and silk manufacturers of the New England and other Atlantic coast states, he might have staved off for some years the division that is now disrupting the Republican party; he might have prevented the Democrats from carrying the congressional elections in November 1910, and secured his own re-nomination and re-election in November 1912. But Mr. Taft has been a Republican office-holder almost continuously from 1881, when he was appointed assistant prosecuting attorney of Hamilton county, Ohio, within a year after he received his diploma from the law school at Cincinnati. He owes much to the Republican machines, state and federal, and after he became President he apparently was unable to dissociate himself from the machine or to get outside its environment.

Viewed from within the machine there was nothing threatening about the insurgent movement in the Republican party—nothing to fear from the popular support that the insurgent movement was winning in the western states. Nor from the same interested standpoint was there anything in the least remarkable in the use that the old guard of the Republican party in the House and Senate was making in the extra

---

* *Edinburgh Review*, No. 430. Pp. 283–288.

session of 1909 of its power to frame a tariff. Similar power had been used in a similar way by the Republicans when the McKinley tariff was enacted in 1890, and again in 1897, when the Dingley Act was framed. It had been used in the same way by the dominant group of Democratic senators in 1894 when President Cleveland and Wilson, the chairman of the committee of ways and means of the House of Representatives, were intent on a general downward revision of the tariff of 1890. In Congress itself the conditions in 1909 were much as they were in 1890, 1894 and 1897, except for the existence of the insurgent movement within the Republican party. It was in the country that political conditions had so enormously changed since the revision of 1897. In the summer of 1909 people were no longer willing to look on indifferently or with patience at a tariff openly framed for predatory ends.

Mr. Taft failed to realise this change. From inside the machine is a poor standpoint to survey changes in the political thought of a country ; for a machine is always concerned with votes and the manipulation of votes, and not with political thought or political principles. It is clear that Mr. Taft did not realise, and does not even yet realise, the attitude of the country towards the tariff revision of 1909. Even the defeat of the Republicans in 1910 and his later defeat at the primaries, did not bring it home to him ; for three years after he signed the Payne-Aldrich bill—in his speech of August 1, 1912, accepting the nomination of the Republican party—he asserted that the tariff bill had been ' most viciously misrepresented ' and that the Act had ' vindicated itself.' Whether Mr. Taft realised the change or not, the important fact is that it had no weight with him. He signed the popularly detested Payne-Aldrich bill as light-heartedly as Harrison signed the McKinley bill, or McKinley signed the Dingley tariff ; and the president and the old guard of the Republican party have been on the down grade ever since.

The first landmark in this downward grade was the election of 1910, which gave the Democrats their present large majority in the House of Representatives, and deprived the Republicans of the control of the Senate. The second landmark was Mr. Taft's degradation of the office of President when he took the stump in opposition to Mr. Roosevelt in the popular

campaign in the states with direct primaries preceding the Republican national convention. The third landmark was the action taken by the old guard at Chicago in manipulating votes so as to ensure the re-nomination of Mr. Taft. This action was as audacious and as insulting to the electorate as the handling of the tariff in 1909. The old guard was equally reckless and audacious at the Chicago convention in nominating Mr. Sherman as candidate for the office of Vice-President; for it is well known that Mr. Sherman is one of the reactionaries.

Every conceivable provocation was offered to the insurgents by Mr. Taft and the reactionaries from May 1909 to the Republican national convention in June 1912. Even Mr. Taft's reciprocity policy strengthened the insurgent movement among the farmers in the western states, and gave it its first hold on the farmers in New England. It had this effect—an effect easily traceable in the direct primaries in April and May, at which the President was defeated by Mr. Roosevelt—because while Mr. Taft, in order to secure reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada, was ready to sacrifice the protection of the farmers against the only country from which they can have any general or continuous competition, he had in the session of 1911 vetoed all the bills passed by the Democrats of the House and the coalition of insurgent Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, which were intended to reduce the duties on many of the articles which farmers must buy.

It is a tradition that a President must have a second nomination. The blunders of Mr. Taft were also the blunders of the Republican party. There was a partnership in most of them; certainly in Mr. Taft's attitude in 1909 toward the insurgents, in the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich bill, in the President's ill-starred appearances on the platform in the bitter personal conflict with Mr. Roosevelt, and also in the rough-riding methods at Chicago; but, after the sweeping defeat of the Republicans in 1910, it was inevitable that the insurgents would oppose the re-nomination of Mr. Taft in 1912. Subsequently it became obvious that if Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressives were defeated at Chicago in June, the Progressives must organise as a new party and nominate candidates in opposition to Mr. Taft and Mr. Sherman. As already mentioned, the situation was aggravated by the methods adopted by the committee on

contested delegations. No one day's work of the old guard of the Republican party added more to the popular strength of the insurgent movement between the time when Mr. Roosevelt ' threw his hat into the ring ' in February and his nomination by the convention of the National Progressive party in August.

Since June much popular strength has accrued to the movement, often in quite unexpected places. In connexion with this movement, which to-day gives such extraordinary interest to the present presidential campaign, two facts must be kept in mind. First that it is by no means exclusively a movement for the election of Mr. Roosevelt, and secondly that it permeates state quite as much as federal politics—a fact which explains the comprehensiveness of the platform adopted by the Progressive party at its national convention.

Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt's personality is a great factor in the election. Thousands of men and women who are of the Progressive party, especially in the western states, regard him as the greatest of modern Americans—as a man full of ideals, and intent only on serving the nation at a new crisis in the history of the republic. On the other hand, thousands of men, especially in the eastern states, who are also in the movement, entertain no such exaggerated estimate of Mr. Roosevelt. They recall that he had no serious quarrel with the Republican machine while he was President ; that from 1901 to 1906 he was not disposed to come to issue with the protectionist wing of the big business interests ; that in 1904 the big business interests, such as the Standard Oil Company, the Steel Trust, and the Harriman interests, subscribed largely to his campaign fund ; and that in 1907 he was amazingly complaisant in sanctioning the capture of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company by the Steel Trust, the most remarkable coup in the history of American trusts. Mr. Roosevelt's relations with Platt, who was the Republican boss of New York ; with Quay, who was the most notorious of Republican bosses in Pennsylvania ; and with Hanna, the national Republican boss, are all recalled ; as are his exertions for the re-election of Mr. Lodge, a reactionary Republican, as senator from Massachusetts at a critical stage in the election of 1911.

These critical supporters of Mr. Roosevelt also recall his tendency to exalt the presidential office from 1901 to 1909 ;

the military pomp and display quite new to American traditions with which he surrounded it; his belligerent tendencies, and love of the showy aspects of war. They refer to his egoism and his ambition; to his conviction that he is the only man who can effectually serve the American nation in these days when great and new problems, industrial and political, are confronting the country, and when for good or ill a new and wider conception of government is spreading over the land, and realising itself in many of the more radical of the western states.

Moreover, these supporters of Mr. Roosevelt do not admire his part in the personal conflict with Mr. Taft. They regard him as even more to blame than Mr. Taft for the degradation of the presidential office that characterised that part of the campaign. They also distrust and dislike two of his most prominent supporters—one from New York, who is understood to have given freely of his great wealth to finance the progressive movement, and the other from Pennsylvania. The altruism of the first of these two men in particular is under suspicion in consequence of his prominence in the insurance investigations in New York in 1904, and also in consequence of his long, intimate and active connexion with the Steel and Harvester Trusts. But though Mr. Roosevelt is thus criticised by many of his own supporters, they continue actively at work in the campaign in his behalf, because they are weary of the Republican party; weary of the government that this party has given the country since 1897; anxious to see an end to the old guard and to its domination at Washington and at some of the state capitols; and because they believe that there is not to-day, and never has been since Cleveland's second term, —1893–97—any hope in the Democratic party. They point to the reactionary attitude of the Democrats from the southern states; to Tammany Hall; to the corruption of the cities in which municipal government has been a monopoly of the Democrats; to the close connexion of the Democratic party in almost every state with the liquor interests; to the way in which protected manufacturers have leaned on both Republican and Democratic politicians; and they remember how Cleveland was thwarted over the Wilson bill by Democratic senators in 1894.

The case of these Progressives is that they are using Mr.

Roosevelt, rather than being used by him ; that the Progressive party will not for long be in any measure dependent upon his personality ; and, finally, that some such movement as that which he is now leading had to come, or hundreds of thousands of young men, born into the Republican party but now weary of it and full of distrust of it, would have had no alternative but to throw in their lot with the Socialist party which has made such headway in the United States in the last ten years. If the candidature of Governor Wilson and Governor Marshall is discussed with these supporters of Mr. Roosevelt, they at once concede that, with the exception of Cleveland, these are the strongest candidates nominated by the Democratic party since the Civil War, and they concede also that the progressive wing of the Democratic party was in the ascendant at the Baltimore convention. They concede further that the Democrats are ostensibly more in earnest for tariff revision than the National Progressive party. But they have lost confidence in both of the old parties, and they insist that politics can be little more than a game of see-saw, with advantages increasingly accruing to the big business interests, as long as the great army of electors, for want of other opportunities, must march to the polls every two years to maintain one or other of the old and discredited parties in power at Washington and at the state capitols.

While, then, the Progressive movement had its origin in the question of the tariff in 1906, the Progressives now urge that the tariff and the trusts are subordinate to the larger question as to who shall rule at Washington and at the state capitols—the bosses and the big business interests, or the people. Their fight is to recapture the machinery of government from the big business interests, and from the bosses of both the Republican and the Democratic parties. So far as the popular campaign has gone, it is obvious that from the Progressive point of view the tariff is less an issue than it was in 1890, 1892, 1896 and 1910. On the other hand, Governor Wilson and the Democrats, encouraged by the sweeping successes at the congressional elections two years ago, are seeking to make the tariff the all-important question. Mr. Taft and the Republicans remain on the defensive all along the line ; and in particular they claim that they are defending the integrity of the United

States constitution and the supremacy of law and order as conceived by the authors of the constitution.

It seems that, of the three candidates, Mr. Wilson has the best chance of carrying the election. But to succeed he must hold all the votes that went to the Democrats at the congressional elections two years ago—for the country has been normally Republican ever since the Civil War—and his ability to do this, despite the generally high regard in which he is held, is doubtful. The election would surely have been his had he been opposed only by Mr. Taft. With Mr. Roosevelt in the field there is nothing sure for Mr. Wilson ; for it must be remembered that the vote two years ago was rather a protest against Mr. Taft and the Republicans than a vote of popular confidence in the Democratic party. At that time the Democrats had been in a minority in Congress since 1897, and they had certainly done nothing to warrant a vote of confidence. They had not even conducted an extensive propaganda in the constituencies against the Payne-Aldrich bill. That work had been left to the ten and fifteen cent magazines, which, like the insurgent Republicans, had concentrated their attack on the increased duties on cottons and silks, and in particular on the notorious Schedule K, with its lavish protection for the wool-growers of the inter-mountain states and the woollen manufacturers of New England, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Mr. Roosevelt will certainly draw largely from the vote that went to the Democrats at the congressional elections, and he will also attract to his support tens of thousands of votes which, except for his candidature, would in this election have gone to the Socialists. The probability is that Mr. Taft will fall into the third place.

To be elected President a candidate must secure at least 266 out of the 531 votes in the electoral college—a clear majority of the whole number, which consists of one vote each for every senator and congressman. Conditions are so uncertain that within two weeks after Mr. Roosevelt's nomination in August even Republican newspapers were conceding the probability that neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Taft would secure a majority of the electoral college. There need consequently be no surprise in England if the cablegrams from New York and Washington of November 6 and 7

convey the news that the election, like that of 1876, has been thrown into the House of Representatives.

In this case the House must act before March 4, 1913, when Mr. Taft's term and that of the existing Congress expires; and the election will be made, not by the House of Representatives to be chosen on November 5, but by the existing House, in which the Democrats have a majority. An election by the present House of Representatives would mean that Mr. Roosevelt would be out of the running; although by the terms of the constitution the House is directed to choose among the three candidates obtaining most votes in the electoral college. The vote is taken by states—each state, no matter what its congressional delegation, having only one vote. In the present House, in spite of the large Democratic majority, the Democrats control exactly one half of the states; and it is conceivable that, even in the House of Representatives, it would be impossible to obtain a clear majority for Mr. Wilson. While the choice of the President, in case of the failure of the electoral college to act, is relegated to the House, the choice of the Vice-President is the function of the Senate; and if the House fails to elect a President, the constitution provides that the candidate elected as Vice-President by the Senate shall become President.

POLITICS AND PRICES.

1. **Monetary Economics.** By W. W. CARLILE. Ed. Arnold. 1912.
2. **The Standard of Value.** By Sir DAVID BARBOUR. Macmillan. 1912.
3. **An Introduction to the Study of Prices.** By WALTER T. LAYTON. Macmillan. 1912.
4. **The Meaning of Money.** By HARTLEY WITHERS. Smith, Elder, and Co. 1909.
5. **La Science Economique.** By YVES GUYOT. Paris: Librairie C. Reinwald. 1907.
6. **Report of the Gold and Silver Commission.** 1888. (C. 5512.)
7. **Articles in 'Statist,' 'Economist,' and 'Economic Journal.'**

'IT'S all the fault of the Government: it's entirely the 'fault of the Government.' This was the answer made by the head of one of the great banking houses of London when questioned by the present writer as to the causes of the fall in the price of Consols, and it expresses a view widely held in the City. That some further examination of the problem is needed will be admitted even by those who are most convinced that the Government is primarily to blame. There is indeed always a danger that economic facts may be twisted to political uses, and, at this moment, some tariff reformers even go so far as to suggest to popular audiences that the increase in the price of food-stuffs during the past few years is due to free trade—a proposition too obviously dishonest to require refutation. In the following pages, then, an attempt will be made to consider the causes, political and economic, underlying the fall in the price of gilt-edged securities and the contemporaneous phenomenon of the rise in the price of many staple commodities.

At the outset it is desirable to repudiate any intention or inclination to dogmatise. The considerations involved are so numerous and so complex that it is never possible to feel confident that one has taken account of all the essentials of the problem and given the proper weight to each. The utmost that can be done is to present what appears to the writer to be the truth as cautiously and as fairly as possible.

Starting, then, from the emphatic verdict quoted above, the

first precaution which suggests itself is to ask how far the fall in Government securities is a peculiarity of Great Britain. Figures available to everyone show that it is not. The question has been frequently examined by the leading financial papers, and it is unnecessary to do more than quote their conclusions. On July 27 of the present year, the ' Economist ' published the following table comparing the position of the leading securities of our own and five other European Governments :

Security	Price Jan. 1 1906	Price end of June 1911	Price end of June 1912	Price July 24 1912	Fall since Jan. 1 1906	Fall since end June 1911
British 2½% Consols	89⅜	79⅛	76⅜	73⅝	15¾	5½
French Rentes, 3%	99	95	93½	91½	7½	3½
German 3% 1891–3	88	83	79	79	9	4
Austrian 4% Gold Rentes	99	99	95½	96	3	3
Dutch 2½%	79	70½	68½	66½	12½	4
Danish 3% Gold Loan, 1894	91	84	76	76	15	8

It will be seen that in every case there has been a heavy fall both as compared with last year and with the year 1906. Therefore clearly it is unscientific to attribute the whole fall in British securities to the wickedness of the present British Government. It may be added that public opinion both in France and Germany is equally perturbed about the fall in Government securities. In the month of July last, the French Minister of Finance made a speech at a public ceremony on the subject of ' Rentes,' and talked of a conspiracy to depreciate the national stock (' Economist,' July 27, 1912). In the same month the Berlin press published articles deploring the continued fall in Imperial Three per cents.

The disease is therefore not confined to ourselves ; but it will be noticed that the figures in the above table show that, with the exception of the Danish Gold Loan, British securities have fallen more heavily than those of other Governments. This extra fall is all the more noteworthy because the British Government is reducing debt at a fairly rapid rate, while almost all the other countries are still adding to their liabilities. Here, then, is a point which clearly needs special explanation, but before attempting to discover that explanation it is better

to deal with the causes of depreciation which are common to all countries.

The first and most obvious cause is the enlargement of the area of reasonably safe investment. The resources of the world are being developed with extraordinary rapidity, and all these developments call for capital. Till recently the rank and file of European investors were rather shy of putting their money abroad, with the result that the price of home securities was forced up—possibly to an exaggerated height. In the opinion of the 'Statist' the high level attained in the nineties by first-class securities, and especially by Consols, was altogether abnormal. It was due to the distrust of foreign and colonial investments created by such events as the Baring crisis, the revolutions in Brazil, Argentina, and Chili, the collapse of Australian land speculation and of Australian banking (see 'Statist,' Feb. 10, 1912). Since that period these extra-European countries have re-established themselves in the estimation of the European investor, with the result that the price of home securities has relatively declined.

It may be added that, as regards our own country in particular, a very important change has been effected by the enlargement of the area of trustee investments. In one sense this is a political influence, for there is little doubt that the admission of colonial securities to the list of trustee investments was primarily due to Mr. Chamberlain's desire to confer some financial favour upon the Colonies. The value of the favour is very considerable, for it has meant an appreciable lowering of the rate of interest at which the Colonies can borrow. According to the 'Statist' (Feb. 10, 1912), in the year 1900, when Colonial Government inscribed stocks became trustee securities, their total amount was £220,000,000, and this figure has since been brought up to £350,000,000. A saving of even 1 per cent. on these huge sums is a tremendous boon to colonial taxpayers. British owners of trust funds have also benefited by being enabled to obtain a higher rate of interest. *Per contra*, the credit of the British Government has been lowered, and this involves a contingent loss to British taxpayers. On balance the change was probably justified, for it was hardly fair to the owners of trust funds to maintain at their expense an artificial demand for Consols.

The more general question of the increased popularity of extra-European investments is discussed in considerable detail and with many valuable illustrations by 'A Stockbroker' in the 'Economic Journal' for June 1912. Among the illustrations given, the following table shows very strikingly the change in the relative position of home and foreign railway investments between 1896 and 1911:

Year.	British Railway ordinary stocks.			Foreign and Colonial Railway ordinary stocks.		
	Average mean price.	Average Dividend.	Yield per cent.	Average mean price.	Average Dividend.	Yield per cent.
1896	154·76	5·235	3·4	117·88	6·200	5·2
1911	107·91	5·097	4·7	155·82	8·100	5·2

It will be noticed that according to the above figures the yield of investments in foreign and colonial railways has remained constant, while the yield to the investor in home railways has increased very considerably. Yet we know that there has been comparatively little railway expansion at home and very great expansion abroad with a corresponding call for capital, so that, if other things had remained equal, we should have expected to find home railway stocks appreciating in price and foreign and colonial railway stocks depreciating.

Other things have not remained equal.

There is first the remarkable growth in the public feeling of confidence in extra-European investments, and this has induced many people who formerly only invested at home to send their money abroad. So far as this confidence is justified there is no reason to regret the movement of capital to which it has given rise. It must never be forgotten that a large part of the prosperity of our little island arises out of the development of new countries across the seas by British capital. These countries supply us with fertilizers for our fields, with raw materials for our industries, with food for our people, and with a market for our manufactures. It would have been a sheer impossibility to obtain in such large measure these essentials to the prosperity of Great Britain if we had always kept our capital at home. By no amount of intensive cultivation could we ever have extracted from our limited acreage enough food for our present population, and still less could we have

secured a sufficient supply of the infinitely varied materials which the population requires for its daily work. The picturesque ideal of national self-sufficiency is only attainable by a nation that is willing to remain numerically insignificant and economically stagnant.

There is, however, a possibility that the diversion of investment to foreign and colonial securities may be due to other considerations than those of sound business. It may, for example, be due to fashion. As has been well said, there is fashion in investment as well as in physic and in frocks, and about fashion it is futile to argue. There is a third possibility, namely that many people may have been driven to invest abroad because, for one reason or another, they have been alarmed at the risks attending investments at home. This point of view was pithily expressed to the present writer by a distinguished novelist, who remarked that he was not going to invest his savings in anything that had 'a trade union at 'one end and Lloyd George at the other.' Here, however, we touch at once upon political considerations, and these are better deferred till our examination of the purely economic aspects of the problem is more complete.

The table of railway investments given above shows, not only that there has been a change in the relative position of the two types of investment, but also that the two taken together yield more to the investor: for while the yield of home stocks has increased, the yield of foreign and colonial stocks has remained stationary. If, then, these figures may be accepted as representative of investments generally, they indicate that there has been a net increase in the rate of interest on capital. That this is the case most observers will agree, and the broad inference is that the increase in the supply of capital—great though it be—has not kept pace with the increase in demand. This inference is supported by other facts. The extraordinary growth in the scale of living of large sections of the population in nearly all countries is a matter of common notoriety, while at the same time there has been an enormous increase in expenditure upon military and naval defence and other public services by most national and local governments throughout the world.

This remarkable growth of expenditure, both private and public, has only been rendered possible by an increase

in the world's wealth, but in order to obtain that increased wealth it has been necessary to employ an additional amount of capital. Every additional man set to work requires so many scores, or hundreds, or even thousands of pounds, as the case may be, to provide him with the buildings, the machinery and the materials requisite for his industry. It is not easy to ascertain with precision whether capital is growing in proportion to the growth of wealth. One can only form a general impression, and in our own country at any rate there is reason to believe that people are saving less proportionately than was the case a few years back. The motor-car has been a great incentive to extravagance, and thousands of people who never thought of indulging in the comparatively cheap luxury of a horse are spending at a rate out of all proportion to their resources upon the purchase and upkeep of motor-cars. It is stated that the same phenomenon is even more marked in the United States. Among poorer people there is similar lavishness in other directions. The working classes dress better, travel more, spend more on theatres and music-halls than they did twenty or even ten years ago.

Another factor of considerable importance is the rise in the price of commodities. Whatever may be the cause of this rise, there can be no question that the increased price of commodities is a contributory cause to the increased price of capital. This can be readily explained. Practically all important businesses, whether manufacturing or distributing, are conducted with borrowed money, the money being advanced either upon the security of the goods concerned or upon some collateral security. If, for example, an importer is buying a thousand tons of sugar, he will get from his banker an advance for say, 90 per cent. of the value of the sugar, and in the same way with cotton or wool or any other great staple commodity. It is clear, then, that when prices are high bankers have to find more money than when prices are low. In other words, there is a greater demand for capital. At the same time high prices for commodities involve increased expenditure by the mass of consumers, and consequently a diminished margin for saving. Thus the rise in the price of commodities both increases the demand for, and diminishes the supply of, capital.

What, then, is the cause of the rise in the price of commodities? This is one of the most interesting and one of the most difficult

problems in political economy. The popular assumption is that the rise in prices is due to the increased output of gold. On this delightfully easy hypothesis everything would be referred back to the Transvaal gold mines, and we could possess our economic souls in patience until the mines petered out, sending prices down again, or until some other equally prolific gold strata were discovered, giving prices another upward fillip.

It is with some diffidence that the present writer ventures to challenge a theory which the average man in the street—including the man in Capel Court—appears to accept as fully as he accepts the law of gravitation, and which many leading economists have endorsed. But a theory, if it is to have any scientific value, must be capable of proof, and this theory—the quantity theory of money—has never been proved. It has never even been clearly stated. Take, for example, John Stuart Mill's chapter on money. There the quantity theory is stated with plenty of emphasis, but the statement has no relation to the actual facts of the world. Here are two fundamental statements (' Political Economy ' bk. iii. ch. 8. § 2) : ' As the whole of the goods in the market compose the demand ' for money, so the whole of the money constitutes the demand ' for goods ' ; and again : ' If the whole money in circulation ' was doubled, prices would be doubled. If it was only ' increased one-fourth, prices would rise one-fourth.' Having made these extremely precise statements, Mill goes on to explain that they only refer to a ' state of things in which ' money, that is gold and silver, is the exclusive instrument of ' exchange, and actually passes from hand to hand at every ' purchase, credit in any of its shapes being unknown.' That is to say, the theory only applies to a state of things which never has existed either in this country or in any other country since the world began. By people who live in a work-a-day world this might be considered conclusive, but Mill is so anxious lest any practical application should be given to what he calls the ' scientific truth ' of the quantity theory, that he proceeds to lay down a whole string of further limitations ; and ends by declaring that this doctrine ' has of late years been ' the foundation of a greater mass of false theory and erroneous ' interpretation of facts than any other proposition relating ' to exchange.'

This was written in the sixties, and we do not seem to have greatly advanced since. Take a more modern authority, Professor Marshall. In 1887 this distinguished writer and economist was examined by the Royal Commission on Gold and Silver, appointed as a result of the bimetallic agitation. He said: 'I accept the common doctrine that prices generally 'rise, other things being equal, in proportion to the volume of 'the metals which are used as currency' . . (Q. 9629.) To this, however, he added that: 'Changes in the other things 'which are taken as equal are very often, perhaps generally, 'more important than the changes in the volumes of the 'precious metals.' This is a very useful caution, but it leaves Professor Marshall's 'common doctrine' almost as remote from human interest as Mill's 'scientific truth.' Professor Marshall's evidence further shows the difficulty of giving any definition to the word 'money' which will harmonise the facts of commercial life with the theories of abstract economists. Unlike many other writers, he includes silver as well as gold in the term 'money' for the purposes of the quantity theory: 'I believe that the shillings and half-'crowns in circulation have just the same effect upon 'prices as they would have if they were legal tender: 'I believe that four half-crowns affect prices exactly 'in the same way as a half-sovereign does.' (Q. 9632.) He also includes bank notes, but not cheques. On being further pressed, however (Q. 9638), he admitted that 'the 'amount which people have at their credit at their bankers 'is a very important factor in determining prices.' This statement alone seems to reduce to nullity the doctrine that prices depend on the quantity of metallic money. Indeed Professor Marshall, like Mill, ends by admitting that no practical deductions can be made from the theory. Asked whether there might not be a sensible increase or diminution of the quantity of the currency without an increase or diminution of prices, he answered:

'Yes! As Voltaire, said, an incantation will destroy a flock of sheep if it is accompanied by a sufficient dose of arsenic. So a great rise of prices is possible without a change in the supplies of gold and silver, provided there is a sufficient change in the methods of business. And, as I have already said, we have no statistics of changes in the methods of business.' (Q. 9648.)

When this is the best that can be made of the theory by its professed supporters, there does not seem to be much left for popular use. Yet this theory was used in the eighties to explain why prices had fallen, and is now being used to explain why they have risen. A theory which lends itself so readily to explain divergent phenomena certainly merits Professor Marshall's apt comparison to an 'incantation.' Without intentional disrespect to the economists who have adopted this theory, one cannot avoid the temptation of saying that they seem to have borrowed the philosophic methods of those theologians who escape from every difficulty by postulating a Great First Cause.

Let us examine the theory a little further. There are two quite distinct conceptions of the quantity theory, though both seem to be held simultaneously by many people. One is that an increase in the whole volume of *money* raises prices, because money, as a *medium of exchange*, is balanced against goods: the other is that the increased output of *gold* lowers the estimation in which gold is held as a *measure of value*, and so raises prices expressed in gold.

Where is the evidence in support of either conception? Take the latter first. If gold is less valued than it was, such an important fact would surely have impressed itself on the public imagination; but, as far as can be gathered, nobody seems to be conscious of it. Young ladies are as willing as ever they were to accept gold bracelets; the dentist, the photographer, the artist, the decorator all continue to want gold for their work, and to use it. In a different sphere the demand for gold is notoriously expanding. India absorbs vast quantities of gold every year, and as she grows more prosperous she absorbs more. Brazil, Argentina, and the other new States of South America are taking large quantities of the metal. In Egypt again, it is impossible to move the cotton crop without gold coin, mostly supplied from London. Broadly speaking, the more backward countries have now come into the field as users of gold coin on a large scale; while at the same time in countries with an advanced civilisation the growing prosperity of the middle and wage-earning classes has created an extended demand for gold as ornament. Similarly,

the increased supply of diamonds has not made diamonds cheaper, for more people can now afford to buy them. There is, in fine, absolutely no evidence that the metal gold has depreciated in the world's estimation, and therefore it is impossible to attach any scientific value to the conception of the quantity theory which attributes the rise in prices to the depreciation of gold.

Take the other conception, that the rise in prices is due to an increase in the whole volume of money. Here the underlying idea is that the whole stock of money is in some mysterious way balanced against the whole stock of goods, so that if money becomes more plentiful prices rise, if less plentiful they fall. But where does this balancing take place? Who is the superhuman salesman who holds the scales? And how does he charge the respective platters? On the money side is he only to put in gold, or must he add silver and bank notes, cheques and book credits? On the goods side is he to put in only material commodities and to ignore the vast mass of immaterial services which are exchanged for money? These are questions which no two exponents of the theory answer in the same way. Nor does any one of them clearly explain whether a separate pair of these magical scales is to be set up for each country, or whether there is to be one pair for the whole world—one pair of scales which will balance all the myriad streams and pools and wells of money in all its various forms against the millions and billions of separate items of exchangeable wealth!

The average mind reels before such a conception. Yet it is inherent in the statement of the quantity theory put forward by distinguished and sober writers. Sir David Barbour, who took a very active part in the bimetallic controversy in the eighties, has recently published in convenient compass the conclusions at which he then arrived. He is a strong partisan of the quantity theory, which he thus sets forth:

'The quantity theory may be stated briefly in the following terms:

'Other things being equal, the level of prices is proportionate to the quantity of money.

'As I have assumed that we are dealing with a country that has a gold standard, we may take money in this case to mean gold coins of full legal tender. We may also treat as money uncoined

gold intended to be used as money and which could be coined at any moment.'

This statement is in form sufficiently positive, and it seems to imply that the quantity of money to be considered is the quantity in a particular country. There, at any rate, the theory is obviously false, for the price of wheat in England is largely determined by speculations in the Chicago wheat pit. To take a more precise illustration : It was mentioned above that the cotton crop of Egypt cannot be moved without English gold coin. Sometimes that coin is late in arriving, and according to Sir David Barbour's statement of the quantity theory the result should be to send down the price of Egyptian cotton because the cotton is waiting to be sold and there is no gold to buy it. But in practice this does not happen. Dealers simply suspend operations till the gold arrives, and then buy at prices largely determined by the price at which another kind of cotton is selling in the United States.

It will be noticed that Sir David Barbour's definition of money differs widely from Professor Marshall's as well as from Mill's. It differs even more widely from the definition of the man of business whose living is made by handling money. Those who wish to see how monetary problems are looked at by men who have to deal with them from a practical point of view every day of the week may be strongly recommended to read Mr. Hartley Withers' ' Meaning of Money,' a little volume which has with good reason already become a standard text-book, and now takes the place which Bagehot's ' Lombard Street ' occupied for an earlier generation.

As Mr. Withers well says : ' The money of modern ' English commerce and finance is the cheque, and the credit ' dealt in in the London market is the right to draw a cheque.' But it may be answered, Cheques are drawn against gold, and therefore we come back to the quantity of gold in the world, or at any rate to the quantity available in the country. Not at all. Cheques are drawn against every realisable form of wealth. They are drawn against wheat, iron, sugar, timber, paper, calico, and so on through a list of commodities which would fill many pages of this Review. Cheques are also drawn against prospective profits. When a banker has confidence in the character of the client and in the soundness of that client's business, he will make him an advance—it may

be £20 or it may be £20,000—and instantly thus much effective money has been created. For the advance takes the form of a credit at the bank, and against this credit the customer can draw cheques which will be accepted as cash by every person who has confidence in the honesty of the drawer and the solvency of the banker.

For further illustration of this point the reader may be referred to Mr. W. W. Carlile's 'Monetary Economics'—one of the most valuable of recent contributions to economic literature. Mr. Carlile possesses in a high degree the somewhat rare quality of clear thinking, and has rendered great service to the study of economics by brushing away many of the verbal cobwebs under which that study is too often buried. With regard to the point here dealt with, he happily remarks: 'The coining of the prospective profits of an industry into the 'ready money with which to carry it on has been, for the 'alert business man, the great achievement of the English 'banking system.' The same point was brought out with characteristic vigour and lucidity by the first Lord Farrer in the course of the bimetallic controversy. In a pamphlet published by the Gold Standard Defence Association in 1898—a pamphlet as valuable to-day as it was then—Lord Farrer concisely describes the sequence of events which actually occurs:

'As business increases, credit money increases; and if the effect of increasing business is to raise prices, and thus to require an additional quantity of media of exchange, credit increases in proportion, and the additional media are at once forthcoming. **Thus the quantity of money in use at any given time depends on business, and not business on money. It is business which creates money, and not money which creates business.'**

Again it may be said: 'But surely we have to come back 'to gold, for if commercial confidence is destroyed people will 'no longer accept cheques; they will demand gold.' Even that is not true, for experience has shown that in times of panic people are quite satisfied if they can get Bank of England notes, which can be manufactured to an unlimited extent the moment the Bank Charter Act is suspended. Indeed, the mere announcement, or even the rumour, that this Act will be suspended is sufficient to arrest the panic without the actual issue of notes.

The explanation is that our effective currency does not depend on gold, but on credit. It is, as has been well said, 'a currency of promises,' * the cheapest and the best currency that man has ever devised. As long as the ordinary banker's promise is regarded as sufficiently good, cheques are universally accepted; when the ordinary banker's power to honour his promises becomes doubtful, appeal is made to the legal tender promises of the Bank of England as expressed in Bank notes. They are universally accepted even in time of panic, because behind the promise of the Bank of England is in effect a promise from the whole British nation. These promises, progressively rising in validity, are expressed in gold. But their real basis is not gold or any single form of wealth; it is the whole volume of marketable assets. Or, as the first Lord Farrer was fond of saying, the pyramid of credit is not inverted, with its apex resting upon a minute quantity of gold; the pyramid is the right way up, broad based upon all the forms of wealth that men interchange.

Nor is it possible to trace any connexion between the amount of gold in the country and the amount of effective currency. The aggregate value of the cheques passed through the Bankers' Clearing House fluctuates enormously from week to week. For example, for the week ending July 10, 1912, the total was £293,000,000, and this was followed in the next two weeks by amounts of £332,000,000 and £263,000,000 respectively. These fluctuations were obviously due to variations in business or in speculation, not to the amount of gold in the country.

The only point at which gold comes in is as a backing to the notes issued by the Bank of England, and thus indirectly as a backing to what is known as the Bank Reserve, which consists of notes as well as coin. For example, on September 18, 1912, the gold coin and bullion in the issue department of the Bank of England was £40,255,555, against notes issued £58,705,555. On the same date the Bank Reserve in the banking department was notes £30,157,580, gold and silver coin £1,376,880, or a total reserve of £31,534,460. This was the reserve of legal tender money held by the Bank

* See an illuminating article on 'The Golden Sovereign,' by A. W. Gattie, in *Fortnightly Review*, vol. lxxxiii., N.S.

against public and other deposits, i.e. against the power of the Government Departments and private persons to make effective currency by drawing cheques. The proportion on September 18, was just over 50 per cent., i.e. for every £1 legal tender money held by the Bank of England its customers could draw £2 in cheques.

But this proportion is not constant. It varies from week to week, falling as low as 40 per cent. and sometimes rising to over 55 per cent. It is therefore clearly impossible to assert, even as regards the transactions of the Bank of England alone, that there is a direct connexion between the amount of gold in the vaults of the Bank and the amount of effective money created by the Bank. But that is not all. The Bank of England is the banker of all other banks, and these other banks treat their deposits with the Bank of England as part of their 'cash' reserve. They in turn manufacture effective money by giving their customers the right to draw cheques; but they are less cautious than the Bank of England in the proportion of the reserve which they hold. They consider they are well on the safe side with a reserve of 18 per cent., and according to the state of business that proportion may fall as low as 13 per cent. or rise above 20 per cent. When these facts are grasped it will be seen that by no arithmetical subtlety can any constant proportion be established between the ever-fluctuating aggregate of bank credits and the amount of gold in the country.

Faced with these facts the apologists for the quantity theory fall back upon the allegation that in the sixteenth century the influx of silver into Europe sent up prices. It is sufficient to answer that nobody clearly knows what happened in the sixteenth century; while it is certain that whatever did happen, the whole system of commerce and finance was then so different that no inferences of any present value can be drawn. There only remains the alleged evidence of index numbers. But what does this amount to? Here, for example, are two pairs of figures taken from a table given by Mr. Layton in his little book on the 'Study of Prices.' Between 1891 and 1910 the Sauerbeck index number for food prices *fell* from 77 to 74; between the same two years the index number for raw materials *rose* from 68 to 81. Do the advocates of the quantity theory expect the world to believe

that the increased output of gold simultaneously sent down food prices and sent up the prices of raw materials?

Let us look at the matter a little more closely. Mr. Sauerbeck's numbers, and also those published by the 'Economist,' are obtained by averaging a number of separate prices of different commodities. But such an average is nothing more than an arithmetical expression. For example, the weekly price lists published in the 'Economist' show that between August 26, 1911, and September 7, 1912, copper *rose* from £59 10s. to £83; linseed oil *fell* from £42 5s. to £33 15s.; beef *rose* from 4s. to 4s. 10*d*.; butter *fell* from 139s. to 126s.; bacon was stationary. Is it seriously contended that by averaging these variations we can determine whether gold has appreciated or depreciated? To show the absurdity of such a proposition it is sufficient to point out that the average would be altered if the price of one article in the list changed considerably through causes admittedly peculiar to that article. With all respect to the eminent statisticians who work out these index numbers, it is no more possible to deduce any practical inference from such averages than it is to infer the actual depth of a river at any given point from the statement that the average depth is three feet. The fallacy of averages is one that seems ever to haunt the human mind.

It is submitted that there is not a scrap of reliable evidence that the general purchasing-power of the golden sovereign has declined. Many staple commodities have gone up in price; some have gone down. But pounds and shillings and pence are not used only to buy dull things like pig iron and linseed oil. They also command the purchase of an infinite variety of comforts and luxuries, pleasures and playthings, of which index numbers take no count. Most of these things are being produced more cheaply to-day, or in better quality, than ever they were, and a man—or, what is more important, a woman—can get at least as much out of a sovereign as he got ten or twenty years ago. The truth is that people are spending more on what may be called the 'extras' of life—on better and more frequently varied clothing, on better or more elaborate houses and furniture, on travelling, on books and pictures, bicycles and cameras, theatres and music halls, golfing, cricket, football, and tennis, motor cars and yachts;

and on such doubtful luxuries as Government inspectors and insurance commissioners. The production of all these things has involved a disproportionate growth in the amount of labour and capital employed in urban industries, with the result of a relative decline in the output of food-stuffs and raw materials. The primary requisites of life and industry, produced largely by hard human labour, have tended to grow dearer ; the 'extras,' produced mostly by machinery, have grown cheaper.

What, then, has been the real effect of the increased output of gold ? To the present writer it seems that the true explanation is given by M. Yves Guyot in his 'Science Economique,' and by Mr. Carlile in the book already referred to. M. Guyot argues that the opening of a mine of gold means the creation of new wealth, and the effect is to stimulate the demand for other goods of all sorts to exchange for this new wealth. The same general results, he contends, would follow the opening of a rich mine of coal or iron. Mr. Carlile arrives independently at the same conclusion, and gives a very happy illustration of his own experience in New Zealand in 1867, when, owing to the richness of the pasture and the prevailing high price of wool, wealth rolled in upon the colonists and prices proportionately rose :

'Sixpence, indeed, was practically the lowest coin in use. A good many of the phenomena thus, it appears, that ordinarily accompany the opening of a successful goldfield, and which the quantitative economists associate exclusively with discoveries of gold, had, in that purely pastoral centre, come into existence.'

In the case of wool or iron these phenomena would be fleeting, for the increased output would itself operate to bring down prices and so to diminish the volume of wealth obtainable in exchange for the wool or iron. But the price of gold is not brought down by the increased output. However much gold is produced in South Africa or elsewhere, every ounce of it can be sold in London to the Bank of England for £3 : 17 : 9 cash down ; or to the Royal Mint for £3 : 17 : 10½ payable after coinage. In other words, the possessor of gold can always obtain a fixed equivalent of legal tender currency in the commercial capital of the world. With that currency he can discharge any debt or legal obligation—

including the obligation to pay taxes—and he can command an infinite variety of commodities and services throughout the habitable globe. Thus the increased output of gold compels an increased demand for other forms of wealth, and in that sense tends to raise prices. But the prices, if they actually rise will be raised not because the quantity of goods in the world is measured against the quantity of gold, but because new wealth has been brought into the world, and its owners are demanding other wealth in exchange.

It must be added that the increased output of gold, by increasing the demand for other forms of wealth, increases the demand for capital to produce that wealth, and so tends to raise the rate of interest. But this consideration may be counterbalanced by the more direct effect of an influx of gold upon the London money market. For since the Bank of England is obliged by law to take all gold offered, it must get rid of the gold that it does not want to keep. This it does by lending on easier terms, i.e. by lowering the Bank rate. Other bankers have to follow suit, and many bankers rather than lend their money on bills at a low rate of discount will buy Stock Exchange securities, so that an influx of gold tends to raise the price of securities.

At the same time, the lowered rate of discount will encourage manufacturers and importers to extend their operations, and this will in the first instance tend to raise the price of commodities. But that effect may be only fleeting, for if manufacturers can borrow cheaply they can produce cheaply, and to this extent the cheapness of capital may mean cheaper commodities. These considerations show how impossible it is to dogmatise as to the actual effects of the increased output of gold. It is not suggested that the above analysis covers all the intricacies of a most complicated problem, but it suffices to dispose of the assumption that the output of gold is a Great First Cause, which will explain almost any economic fact.

Let us now very briefly consider what are the causes of the special depression from which British Government securities have suffered as compared with similar securities in other countries. Apart from the enlargement of trustee investments already referred to, the most important cause seems to be the Irish Land Purchase Act of 1903. The professed purpose of

this Act was to enable Irish tenants to buy the freehold of their farms. What it actually did was to give the freehold to the tenants for less than nothing, i.e. in return for a smaller annuity for a limited number of years than the judicial rents they were paying. At the same time, the Act gave the landlord a much larger price for his interest in the land than he could have commanded in the open market. This double subsidy to Irish landlords and Irish tenants was effected at the cost of British credit. The steady persistent sales of Irish Land Stock upon the London market have done more than any other single cause to depress Consols.

There seems also to be clear evidence that a contributory cause to the depression is to be found in the high rate of taxation—especially the high death duties—and in the speeches of Mr. Lloyd George. The high death duties have involved frequent sales of securities, and the money has not been re-invested, as would be generally the case where private individuals alone are concerned, but has been expended as income by the Government. At the same time Mr. Lloyd George's rhetorical effusions have certainly frightened a good many investors and induced them—very foolishly in many cases—to transfer their money from good home securities to doubtful investments abroad. The mischief has been aggravated by the dishonesty of financial agents, who have exploited this quasi-panic for their own profit.

In reply to these charges, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his defenders declare that the Liberals have paid off more debt than has ever been done before in a like period. This answer is excellent for platform purposes, but it will not bear analysis. So far as the answer is intended to extol the financial virtue of Mr. Lloyd George it is absolutely misleading. The National Debt of this country consists of two distinct categories, (*a*) the 'dead weight debt,' which is only reduced so far as provision is each year made for its reduction, and by casual surpluses; (*b*) 'Other capital liabilities,' which are reduced automatically by annuities fixed at the time the liabilities were incurred, and are charged on the Army or Navy or Civil Service votes as the case may be. Over this latter element of debt reduction the Chancellor of the Exchequer has no control, and for its amount he can claim no credit. He is

only concerned to provide for the reduction of the dead weight debt. Let us see what has happened. Mr. Lloyd George has been Chancellor of the Exchequer for three years ; Mr. Asquith held that office for an equal period. The best test we can apply is to compare their records with one another and with that of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach during the three years preceding the South African War. The figures will be found in the House of Commons Paper 84 of 1912 :

BUDGET PROVISION FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE DEAD WEIGHT DEBT

Year	Under Sir Michael Hicks-Beach	Year	Under Mr. Asquith	Year	Under Mr. Lloyd George
	£		£		£
1896–7	7,220,943	1906–7	9,620,615	1909–10	3,531,419
1897–8	7,360,292	1907–8	10,909,266	1910–11	6,639,648
1898–9	7,576,601	1908–9	9,988,954	1911–12	7,045,018

Thus in no single year has Mr. Lloyd George made as large a provision for the reduction of the debt as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach made at a time when the debt was considerably smaller than it now is and the national revenue very much less. That is not all. The principal object of debt reduction is to maintain the credit of the country so that in time of war the nation may borrow on moderate terms. At the time when Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was steadily putting by over £7,000,000 a year, our national credit stood so high that many people argued with some plausibility that the Sinking Fund was even too large. But during and after the war Consols fell heavily, and therefore an increased effort was needed to restore our national credit. Mr. Asquith realised this, and increased the Sinking Fund by a considerable—though, as events proved, an inadequate—amount. Mr. Lloyd George, in spite of the continued decline in Consols, has actually reduced the Sinking Fund, and by so doing has unquestionably accelerated a further fall in national credit.

This is the most serious fact in the present financial situation, for if a great war were now to break out we should find ourselves, in spite of the great wealth of the nation, in a position of grave anxiety. The broad margin for increased taxation which Mr.

Gladstone was always so anxious to preserve has been swept away by his successors ; the credit of England, which used to stand so high above that of other countries, has been brought down nearly to their level. Yet the present Government still continues the policy of subsidising electors at the taxpayers' expense ; while the only alternative offered by the Opposition is a different type of subsidy. Apparently the whole art of modern politics consists in buying votes for a party with the money, or the credit, of a nation. EDITOR.

THE PROBLEM OF PERSIA

1. **The Strangling of Persia: A Record of European Diplomacy and Oriental Intrigue.** By W. MORGAN SHUSTER, Ex-Treasurer-General of Persia. T. Fisher Unwin. 1912.
2. **Parliamentary Papers, 1906 to 1912.**

THE origin of the Persian question is not to be found in the Anglo-Russian Convention, the summoning of a Mejliss, the abdication of a Shah, and other things of yesterday. It lies far back in the physical changes which have altered the face of Asia, and is further the product of vast ancient conflicts which only loom dimly in the most distant pages of history. Persia is a land outworn, and, like Stevenson's Olalla, the hands of the dead are in her bosom. She has shared, and is still sharing, in the process of desiccation which has depopulated large areas in Central Asia and left the oldest of civilised continents strewn with half-buried and deserted cities. The process is perhaps intermittent, and is certainly fluctuating. So careful an authority as Sir Sven Hedin is inclined to the belief that the physical condition of Persia is very much what it was when written records begin; but his arguments are too local in character, and are not convincing. No one can doubt that Palestine has undergone some change of climate since the days when it was in very truth a Promised Land; and the desert did not always encroach so straitly upon the valley of the Nile as it does to-day. The fundamental explanation of the plight of Persia is found in its increasing aridity.

The rose-gardens and the plashing fountains of Shiraz illustrate the keynote of Persian poetry but furnish no clue to the defects of climate which have helped to bring an ancient Empire to the verge of dissolution. Within a few marches of Teheran one reaches the verge of the Desht-i-Kevir, the great depression filled with an incrustation of viscous saline mud, which once was probably, like Lake Eyre in Australia, a huge inland sea. To the south-east the salt desert contracts, but only to expand once more into the terrible Desht-i-Lut, the immense expanse of heated sand whence blows a fierce simoom. There are many other lesser stretches of desert in Persia, as well as dwindling lakes. Even Lake Urumiah is said to be

diminishing, and some authorities believe that the volume of water in Persian rivers is much less than formerly. Persia is in any case almost destitute of navigable rivers, and a large proportion of its streams drain into inland lakes or swamps. The first key to the Persian problem is that the country is drying up. The rainfall does not now suffice to keep a tenth of the cultivable area under crops. Irrigation is practised in a primitive yet not wholly ineffectual manner, but Persia will never be the scene of great irrigation achievements except, perhaps, in the valley of the Karun. The whole population is estimated at under ten millions. The oases shelter large sections of the people, but a land in which barren mountains alternate with deserts necessarily produces nomadic tendencies. The nomadic population is very large, and helps to complicate the present situation ; for the Persian nomad hates law and discipline and loves loot.

It must further be remembered that Persia is one of the oldest of Empires. Her greatest glories were attained in the days when her people, who had pressed southward in search of sunshine, had not lost the energy and virility engendered upon the frozen steppes of the north. The sway of Darius extended from the Indus to the Nile ; but the sun of Persia passed its meridian when her archers fell at Marathon, and the conquests of Alexander spelt her ultimate doom. There were many periods of wonderful revival. The incursions of militant hordes brought repeated infusions of new blood. Time and again Persia still bulked largely in the world. In the sixteenth century, under Shah Abbas the Great, she rose for the last time to a position resembling her early splendour. Thenceforward her path lay steadily downwards. The sudden rise of Nadir Shah, the swift invasion of India, the merciless sack of Delhi, were episodes which brought no return of stability. Under the Kajar dynasty the Persian Empire has continuously drifted towards decay. A century ago it was already little more than a shell. The Persians never evolved that marvellous social structure which has enabled the indomitable Chinese race to survive a thousand shocks. They had not the advantage of inhabiting a land of magnificent waterways, of incomparable fertility, and of almost limitless resources. Not only were their numbers limited, but they were never really homogeneous. One wave of invasion after another had left behind its flotsam and jetsam

of humanity. The deserts and the mountains were an unchangeable barrier against the growth of the birth-rate. Climate, in the slow passing of the centuries, placed its ineffaceable mark upon fair-skinned races which no longer knew whence they had come ; and misgovernment and civil war did the rest.

A very broad factor in the Persian problem is the extraordinary variety of the people inhabiting the country. The Iranian element no doubt predominates, but it has been blended with many other stocks. Turkis, Arabs, Beluchis, and Kurds abound, and all are crudely classified as Persian. Arabs are numerous in the south, and along the line of the Karun Valley. Beluchis are found in large numbers around Kerman, and Kurds are almost equally prominent in the region of Lake Urumiah. The paramount tribe of the Kajars is of Turki extraction. Even the famous Bakhtiari mountaineers have no common origin, for they differ widely, and include septs of both the Turki and Semitic types. Amid such varying peoples it is not surprising that instincts of mutual antagonism are generally stronger than any tendency towards the expression of a common nationality. Regarded as a whole, Persia to-day is inhabited by a collection of tribes, and in that respect may almost be said to resemble the North-west Frontier of India. The diversity is unquestionably greater than is found in the neighbouring land of Afghanistan.

The nomadic tribes are rarely true nomads, but shift from summer to winter quarters, according to the season. They have in their character very little of the dreamy mysticism which is commonly supposed to distinguish the modern Persian ; their interests are more material. For the combination of much speculative philosophy with a curiously unpractical outlook upon life, we must turn to the oases and the infrequent cities. The dry climate of Persia seems to sharpen the mind, and it certainly over-stimulates ; but the stimulation is in the direction of talk and not of action. The interminable and inconclusive discussions in the first Mejliss were as typically Persian as the speeches of the crew in Kinglake's storm-tossed brigantine were typically Greek. Climate is at the bottom of the Persian question, from whatever point of view that question is examined. Even opium is said to have a more irritating effect upon the human frame in Persia than elsewhere. Peoples endowed with

such vivid and excitable imaginations do not observe the same standards of accurate statement as the mist-wrapped West; and those gentlemen of England who swallow with touching faith all the stories which reach them from Persia, would probably be a little less credulous if they had pondered over the effect of a dry saline atmosphere on certain ethnic origins.

Yet the Persians are a loveable, if perplexing, race. It is impossible not to be struck by the favourable impression which the better side of their nature invariably makes upon Europeans of high character. The townsmen are industrious enough when properly directed, and a good Persian clerk is generally the most laborious and faithful of servants. Experienced British officers insist that the Persians could fight if well led, but the leaders must be men of another race. The best leader Persia has employed of late, Yeprim, the head of the Teheran police, was a Caucasian; and his death was a serious loss. The physique of those Persians who live an outdoor life is often splendid. The fine stalwart men who throng the caravan ground at such a trade mart as Bunder Abbas would be difficult to match anywhere; but all alike are lacking in that spark of vital mental force, the absence of which marks a nation in decay. Persia conveys the impression of exhaustion, and yet the spectacle of so much physical and mental vigour puzzles the stranger and prevents clear conclusions. Hence the verdicts of travellers regarding the Persian people vary greatly. Mr. D. G. Hogarth has well said that 'to a practical mind like 'Morier's, or still more Curzon's, their life appears a hopelessly 'unsatisfactory compound of pretension with ineffectiveness; 'to a speculative intellect, with a leaning to transcendentalism, 'like Browne's, they are the most gifted of God's creatures.'

The question about which Englishmen have now to make up their minds is whether this medley of tribes, inhabiting a region of deserts and mountains and oases, with a few large tracts of really fertile soil, was ever able to govern itself by purely constitutional methods; whether it can do so to-day; and failing representative government, whether there is any possible alternative expedient. It is quite clear that for the present the days of a despotic Persian autocracy are numbered. The Kajar dynasty is as derelict as the Manchus. It died with Shah Nasr-ed-din, whose rule of nearly half a century left Persia more prostrate than he found it. His son, Muzaffar-ed-din,

was amiable, incapable, and extravagant. Mohamed Ali, the ex-Shah who is now in exile at Odessa, is a somewhat stupid reactionary who is never likely to be enthroned again at Teheran. The present unhappy boy Shah shows few signs of strength. The other aspirants to the throne are incompetent. If ever a powerful autocrat again rules Persia, he will be a man drawn from some other tribe or family.

The immediate cause of the rise of the constitutional movement in Persia was the incapacity and wastefulness of the Shah Muzaffar-ed-din ; the immediate leaders of the people in their revolt were the priests ; and the immediate influence which brought about the signing of the first Persian Constitution was that of Great Britain. The true story of the appearance of constitutionalism in Persia, and of the drafting of the Constitution, has still to be told. Those who read between the lines of the published despatches may discern something of the truth. The enormous crowds which sought sanctuary in the garden of the British Legation in July 1906 ; the refusal of the people to accept reforms unless they were guaranteed by the British Government ; the ceaseless activities of the British representative, Mr. Grant Duff ; the strong representations which finally induced the Shah Muzaffar-ed-din to sign the Rescript summoning a National Assembly, are things which tell their own tale. The first Mejliss assembled in October, and the Constitution was signed at the end of the year. It was said at the time that Muzaffar-ed-din was moribund when he signed it. What is certain is that his successor, Mohamed Ali, was hostile to the new movement from the outset, though he professed to accept it with a good grace. Had it not been for the powerful exercise of British influence, rather tardily emulated by Russia, the people of Persia would probably have failed to obtain either Mejliss or Constitution in that stormy autumn and winter of 1906. Sir Edward Grey was at that time Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, as he is to-day ; and when we are asked in impassioned invective to condemn his present attitude towards Persia, it is well to remember that under his auspices the Persian Constitutionalists obtained their first chance of freedom.

The published Persian despatches of the last six years are more engrossing and more vivid than the pages of Macaulay, but no one reads them. Were they studied by those writers and speakers who denounce British policy, there might be

some modification of the present bitterness in many quarters. It would be found that British influence in Teheran was both helpful and patient, and extraordinarily tolerant. It would further be found that after the first few months Russia was cordially in accord with British efforts, and there are many proofs that there was no insincerity in the Russian attitude. The demeanour of both Powers towards the constitutional movement was for years not only extremely sympathetic but highly creditable. The despatches leave a very strong impression that the movement was wrecked from within. Even the hostility of Mahomed Ali, which at length became open, would not have sufficed to destroy constitutional movement but for the folly of the constitutional leaders themselves. The evidence of the despatches is confirmed by unwritten testimony familiar to those who study Persian affairs. There were even moments when the British representatives, both in 1906 and later, seemed to carry their approving interest to the verge of indiscretion. In 1908 Mr. Marling was assuring Persian provincial cities that 'England, as a constitutional country, must always look with 'sympathy on a constitutional movement.' Such a dictum can hardly be endorsed without certain reservations. One wonders what the Secretary of State for India would say about it.

The first Mejliss was an odd body. The members sat on the floor, and any member could speak on any subject. The right of speech was not even confined to members, for strangers could wander in and harangue the gathering. The early proceedings are said to have been orderly, but this was not a quality which was long maintained. In later years the Mejliss developed a habit of sitting for unconscionable lengths of time in secret session. From the outset, in spite of the enormous powers it had exacted from the Shah, it was rarely able to exercise any efficient practical influence upon the Administration. In the provinces its authority was disregarded. An orgy of 'liberty' was soon visible. Sir Cecil Spring-Rice wrote in May 1907: 'In every town there is an independent assembly, which acts 'without consulting the Governor or the Central Assembly 'at Teheran.' The irresponsibility of the Mejliss was reflected in the Ministry. It would require some research to say how many Cabinets have been formed in Persia in the last six years, and a complete list of all the changes of portfolios would reach

formidable length. Ministers would exchange offices with each other, and change back again within a week. Resignations were of almost daily occurrence, but few announcements of resignation were ever taken seriously. 'One might meet 'the Finance Minister in the street,' says Mr. Shuster, 'and 'hear from him that he had "resigned," but he would be found 'at the Council Chamber the following morning.' The one notable achievement of the Mejliss in its early days was the dismissal of M. Naus, the Belgian head of the Customs, and that was a success for which it deserved congratulation. It had few other triumphs. It was very soon under the control of the secret political societies with which Teheran became infested. Mr. Shuster contends that it had no time for serious legislative work, because from the day it was constituted it had to fight for its existence against Mahomed Ali 'and the Foreign 'Powers who largely aided him.' Fortunately other and more impartial and experienced testimony is available.

In August 1907 Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, most temperate and restrained of critics, wrote to Sir Edward Grey: 'The chief 'enemies of the Assembly are its own members. There is great 'want of discipline, or the power of common action, or the 'spirit of self-sacrifice.' He added that the Assembly had done, and was doing, nothing of any practical value; its proceedings were disorderly, and it came to no decision. Two months later, when the Mejliss was a year old, Mr. Marling wrote:—

'The Assembly seems powerless to create any respect for itself; there appear to be no statesmen of constructive ability; taxes are being paid with the greatest irregularity, and even the framework of such elementary administration as once existed has well nigh disappeared.

'In fact, the work of the Assembly during the first year of its existence has been nearly wholly destructive, and in the process of clearing the ground for future reform a good deal that was worth preserving has perished. And it is to be feared that the work of reconstruction on democratic lines will prove beyond the powers of the men at the head of the movement. . . . Another obstacle in the path of reform is to be found in the composition of the Assembly itself. Only a very small minority of the members have even an elementary idea of what the functions of Parliament are. The rest are incapable of comprehending a regular code of laws regularly applied; such a thing is entirely outside their experience, and they probably look on the business of framing laws—which they cannot conceive will ever be enforced—as sheer waste of time. They

would, in fact, turn the Assembly into something between a Debating Society, a Court of Justice, and a Council of State. Not a few also look upon the position of Deputy as merely a means of pushing their own interests. It is hoped that with the diffusion of more correct notions of constitutional government the next elections will result in the return of more enlightened and less self-seeking legislators.'

The hope was not realised, for even Mr. Shuster apparently admits that the second Mejliss was more incompetent than the first. In January 1908 Mr. Marling reported thus :—

'The Assembly has . . . shown no aptitude whatever for its proper functions. . . . But it is also ignorant and corrupt. There is probably only a small minority of the Assembly who are sincere in wishing for reform, or have anything but a vague idea of what it would imply ; and though some of these, such as Taki Zadé, carry great weight in the Assembly, the ignorant majority of Deputies are often swayed by five or six powerful and self-interested members who really guide the work of the House. Of the corruption, a single instance will suffice. Large sums have been collected, mostly by indirect menace from those suspected of reactionary leanings, for the foundation of the National Bank, and lodged with one of the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly. Of this money, which may have amounted to as much as £50,000, no account has been given. It may have been expended in payments of wages and salaries ; it is, however, currently said to have been quietly absorbed by the Members of the Assembly and Anjumans. Should this be true, with dishonesty such as this, and with self-interest and mutual distrust rampant, there is not much to be hoped for from the Assembly as it now exists. Nor is it likely, also, that a new election would result in the return of better Members. The fact is that Persia is not yet, and will not for a couple of generations to come be, fit for representative institutions.'

A later despatch mentions a suggestion for the creation of a Mejliss Club, 'a proposal made by Ehteshem-es-Sultaneh, who, 'apparently in despair of getting any practical results from 'the Assembly itself, believes that the only remedy is to trans-'fer its functions to a private and irresponsible caucus.' Mr. Shuster confirms the allegation of corruption, for he says that 'unfortunately for Persia, the patriotism which impelled 'numbers of her brave Nationalists to fight to depose the 'ex-Shah, and to exercise an admirable self-restraint in the hour 'of victory, did not suffice to keep many of them from profiting 'personally through the chaotic state of the public Treasury,

' and through the entire absence of any check on fraud and ' corruption in the financial Administrations.'

Regarding the corruption of Ministers, Mr. Shuster is unquestionably the most competent witness. He tells us that at a very early stage of his sojourn in Teheran the Sipahdar, who was then Prime Minister, tried to extract from him a sum of 406,000 tumans, ostensibly for the War Department. They compromised for a fourth of the sum demanded, and, says Mr. Shuster, ' even that payment has troubled my conscience ' at times.' The Amir Azam, Acting Minister of War, endeavoured to draw the pay of the troops twice over. During the whole time Mr. Shuster was in Teheran improper claims for money were constantly being presented to him with the approval of the Cabinet. When the Bakhtiari chieftains returned to the capital at his request, to assist in the expulsion of Mahomed Ali, their ' wholesale attempts at looting the Treasury ' were so preposterous that he was forced several times to threaten to resign. Mr. Shuster seeks to draw a sharp distinction between Ministers and members of the Mejliss, but the only marked distinction was that Ministers had more chances of peculation. The ordinary Nationalists were not incorruptible, as has been shown, while the Bakhtiari ' liberators ' were shameless in their greed for plunder. The recent annals of Ispahan contain examples of Bakhtiari corruption even more vivid than the revelations of Mr. Shuster. It would be unfair and untrue to charge all Persian Nationalists with a zest for unwarrantable spoils. Some of them, notably such men as Taki Zadé, have clean hands, but among the majority those who are still honest have chiefly suffered from lack of opportunity.

The corruption of Persian political life must be recorded, but it is difficult to condemn it. The traditions of Persian politics sanction corruption, and the Treasury has always been a source of plunder for everyone in authority from the Shah downwards. The advent of constitutionalism could not have been expected to abate the thirst for loot. The tribesmen rob caravans, the officials rob the taxpayers, the politicians and courtiers rob the Treasury. Forms of Government may change, but these tendencies endure in Persia, as in most uncontrolled Eastern countries. Nor can we criticise too severely the defects of the constitutional movement, as revealed in the glimpses which have been quoted. The business of Englishmen at this juncture

is not to apportion blame, but to inquire whether representative government in Persia has any present prospect of success. The records of the past six years are not hopeful. Sympathy must not prevent us from drawing candid conclusions. The story of the rise of constitutionalism in Persia has many pathetic aspects, but the pathos is most pronounced when we reach the period of admitted failure.

The occurrences which led to the downfall of the first Mejliss in 1908 are familiar knowledge. The Shah Mahomed Ali destroyed the Mejliss by force on the 23rd of June. The Nationalists at Tabriz rose in revolt against his authority, and held out until the following May, when a Russian force occupied the city for the preservation of the lives of foreigners. Nemesis overtook the Shah in July 1909, when Nationalist forces advancing simultaneously from north and south took Teheran. Mahomed Ali abdicated, and his son Ahmed Mirza was proclaimed in his stead. The second Mejliss assembled in November 1909 and ceased to exist in December 1911. Mr. Shuster declares that the 'open intervention' of the Russian and British Legations 'directly contributed' to the overthrow of the first Mejliss. The statement does not bear examination. The representatives of both Powers repeatedly adjured Mahomed Ali to maintain the Constitution, both before and after the bombardment of the Parliament House. They certainly took the view that it was important to keep the Shah on the throne, because a long Regency meant that Persia would fall deeper into anarchy; and events have proved that the latter assumption was correct. Yet throughout the period between the destruction of the Mejliss and Mahomed Ali's abdication, nothing was done by either Power which tended either to keep the Shah on the throne or to thwart the aims of the Nationalists. The Russian occupation of Tabriz was distinctly favourable to the Nationalist cause. The Nationalist defenders of the city were in dire extremity when the Russian troops arrived. Sir George Barclay wrote that Tabriz 'was only saved from the 'horrors which must have followed surrender to the Shah's 'troops by the arrival of the Russian force.' Mr. Wratislaw, British Consul-General at Tabriz, reported: 'The coming of 'the Russians was looked on as the only way in which 'Tabriz could be saved. The town was now in the last 'extremity, many of the poorer classes lying exhausted

' in the streets, and few of them finding any food but green-
' stuffs.'

The defence of Tabriz against the forces of the Shah was not a second Londonderry. The unheroic story of the sortie in which the American Baskerville was killed sufficiently illustrates the limited courage of the Nationalists, who turned tail in the hour of conflict. The admiration Mr. Shuster bestows upon ' the soldiers of the people ' who captured Teheran and compelled Mahomed Ali to abdicate has equally little justification. His own book reveals that the Bakhtiari chieftains were attracted northward chiefly by the prospect of plundering the Treasury. The army of the north, led by the Sipahdar, was chiefly composed of Caucasian revolutionaries who were not Persian subjects at all. The Nationalists talked a great deal, but they rarely fought. Mr. David Fraser, the special correspondent of *The Times*, says of them that ' they made no effort ' to save Tabriz when a few determined men might have ' raised the siege.' The same witness testifies that Russian intervention at Tabriz meant ' ruination to the Shah's designs.' The whole of the episodes in Persia in 1908 and 1909 have been wilfully misrepresented in order to cast discredit upon British and Russian policy. A careful analysis, not of the wild stories of Persian refugees, but of the evidence of impartial men on the spot, suffices to show that the behaviour of the political Nationalists was contemptible, that the limited action of Russia and Great Britain helped the cause of Constitutionalism, that at no point were the Nationalists embarrassed by the two Powers, and that if they did not afterwards make good the position they gained when Teheran fell into their hands, the fault was due to their own inherent weakness.

It is necessary to pass somewhat rapidly to the events of last year, when Mr. W. Morgan Shuster, an American lawyer who had some experience of financial administration in the Philippines, swept into Persia and sought to galvanise a venerable country according to the most approved precepts of New York. Mr. Shuster arrived at the invitation of the Mejliss, and he cherished the delusion that the Persian deputies had ' an abiding ' faith in our institutions and business methods.' The book in which he tells the story of his failure has become the gospel of the ' sympathisers ' with Persia in this country. His allegations are accepted without question, his contentions are blindly

supported, his recital of his experiences is regarded as convincing proof of the malignity with which Russia and Great Britain wrought the undoing of Persia. Yet if ever a man stood condemned out of his own mouth, that man is Mr. Shuster. If we seek for the reasons of his unfortunate downfall, there is no need to look beyond the pages of his extremely well-written work.

Mr. Shuster was a man of great energy and capacity, with an ardent and sympathetic temperament, endowed with invincible honesty of purpose, and determined to do his utmost to rescue Persia from the slough into which she had fallen. To him the problem appeared comparatively simple. The Mejliss, he argued, had engaged him as Treasurer-General, and he had only to arm himself with sufficient powers to evolve order out of chaos. He knew nothing of Persia, but he had procured Professor Browne's emotional book on the Persian Revolution, very much in the spirit in which a new Viceroy of India once hastened to qualify himself for his new duties by a casual study of Hunter's 'Short History of the Indian Peoples' on the voyage out. The whole enterprise seemed as easy and as obvious as the control of a pea-nut stall in his beloved native land.

No man ever had a more wonderful opportunity than lay before Mr. Shuster when he crossed the Elburz range in May of last year. No man ever misused his chances more grievously. He arrived inflamed with the belief that Russia and Great Britain were the enemies in his path, and that Sir George Barclay and M. Poklewski-Koziell were their chosen instruments of evil. But his greatest mistake was not his open and avowed antagonism to Great Britain and Russia. The manner in which, from the outset, he placed himself at cross purposes with the diplomatic body in Teheran is of comparatively minor importance. The cardinal error which Mr. Shuster committed was that from the very beginning he violated the spirit and the letter of the Persian Constitution.

The cause of his undoing was the blind faith he reposed in the Mejliss. He says: 'The Mejliss was my employer,' and so in truth it was, but only indirectly. The functions of the Mejliss were deliberative, and not executive. Its very title is given by Professor Browne in his translation of the Fundamental Law as 'the National Consultative Assembly.' Its

besetting vice was that it insisted upon grasping executive control. Mr. Marling noted the tendency so long ago as 1907, when he informed Sir Edward Grey that 'the Mejliss, which from 'the beginning has been far too prone to interfere in ordinary 'administrative matters, is now assuming executive functions.' Mr. Shuster encouraged the Mejliss to usurp executive authority. He was hand and glove with the Nationalist deputies, oblivious of the fact that they, in their turn, were in the clutches of the secret political societies which have done so much to destroy the independence of Persia in the last few years. For the Cabinet he had nothing but abuse—his book teems with violent examples—and he confesses that he was determined to defy the authority of the Ministers. Yet the Constitution had not been drafted with the object of making the Cabinet a collection of powerless nonentities. Corrupt and incompetent though some of the Ministers may have been, they were an essential part of the constitutional system, as Ministers must be in any country so governed. Even as it was, the Mejliss had power to review the acts of Ministers to an extent which has never been tolerated in any other constitutional government. Its excessive powers were, indeed, the true cause of the breakdown of the constitutional system in Persia. Again and again the Cabinet appealed to the Mejliss for more freedom, but always in vain save once. The Sipahdar told the Mejliss in March 1911 that 'what was wanted was wider powers for the Cabinet and 'a cessation of interference by the Mejliss with the Executive.' In a message to the Mejliss in August 1911 the Regent, Nasr-ul-Mulk, declared that 'dissensions, theoretical Utopias, 'and the lack of practical sense, have made all government 'impossible, so that crisis has followed crisis, and successive 'Cabinets, during their ephemeral existences, deprived of all 'authority, have been unable to undertake anything for the 'country.' The warnings fell upon deaf ears. On the competence of the Mejliss to undertake executive control the descriptions already quoted are a sufficient illustration; but visionary deputies and the headstrong Treasurer-General were for a time permitted to work their own will. Small wonder that in the end Sir Edward Grey is found telegraphing that 'Shuster 'makes things impossible.' Sir George Barclay had remarked months earlier that 'one cannot but have some misgivings as 'to the results of his headlong progress.'

For a bulwark of constitutionalism, Mr. Shuster in a very short time progressed a very long way indeed. Within little more than a month of his arrival he induced the Mejliss to pass a law which gave him complete control of the collection and expenditure of revenue and overrode the authority of all Ministers. Thus the government of Persia was practically placed solely in the hands of an extremely incompetent and inexperienced deliberative assembly, and of a gentleman who had been exactly forty days in the country. The Ministers were ignored. Such was the singular evolution of 'our institutions and business methods' which Teheran was called upon to bow down and worship. The practical result was to make Mr. Shuster for a time the autocrat of Persia. Let it be conceded that Persia needed an autocrat, and that Mr. Shuster was in many ways a very good autocrat, although intractable and impulsive. Let it be conceded that the Ministers were as inefficient and as venal as he represents them to be. Let it be conceded that he did wonders, that the chaotic finances of Persia were well handled, and that Mahomed Ali's attempt to return to Teheran was chiefly foiled by his energetic retaliation. The fact remains that this was not constitutional government, and that such an astonishing development was never contemplated under the Persian Constitution. When Mr. Shuster proceeded to organise a military force to back up his already untrammelled authority, he was not far short of becoming the virtual dictator of Persia. Possibly it might have been a very good thing for Persia if he had attained and held such unforeseen eminence; but when we are asked by 'the friends of Persia' to shed tears over his untimely disappearance, let us at least plead that we may not be asked to weep in the sacred name of constitutional rule. Mr. Shuster tells us that he hoped in course of time to command a force of 12,000 men, to be styled the Treasury Gendarmerie. The Persian Cossack Brigade, under Russian command, which Mr. Shuster suggests was the arbiter of the destinies of Persia, only had an establishment of 1500 men, of whom 800 were usually on distant detachment duty. It is not difficult to discern that with a boy Shah and an 'unfortunate' Regent, the official who had the Treasury Gendarmerie under his 'direct 'supervision and orders' would have been dictator. It is tolerably certain that Mr. Shuster never consciously aspired

to be Shah in all but name, but had he carried out his plans he would have become so.

The exclusive devotion of Mr. Shuster to the Mejliss ended by making his position impossible. When, on the 29th of November, the Russian Government presented an ultimatum demanding his dismissal, the Cabinet advised the Mejliss to accede to that and other demands. The Mejliss declined to accept the advice tendered by the Cabinet. Mr. Shuster says that under the Constitution the Cabinet therefore ceased to exist. Presumably he refers to Article 67 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law. The point is arguable, but is of no great importance either way. Mr. Shuster was never in a position to take his stand upon the Constitution after he had been a week in Teheran. He had flouted its obvious intentions, and the Cabinet, on being defeated in the Mejliss, took its own line. The breach between Ministers and Deputies, steadily widened by Mr. Shuster, had for some weeks been beyond repair. The Cabinet resolved to try conclusions with the Mejliss. It had the troops upon its side, as well as the Bakhtiari forces for which Mr. Shuster had originally found the money to come to Teheran. Even his trusted commander, Yeprim Khan, deserted him, together with the Teheran police. A 'large 'meeting of all classes' was held at thePalace on the 24th of December, at which the Regent was present. The Regent declared, through another spokesman, that 'the Government 'considered that the Mejliss obstructed them in their foreign 'relations and in the internal administration,' and he therefore proposed that it should be closed. A Rescript was issued the same afternoon, and the Mejliss ceased to exist. There is no evidence, save the assertions of Mr. Shuster, that these summary proceedings were adopted in pursuance of Russian instigation. There is ample evidence that the few responsible men left in Teheran felt that the closing of the Mejliss was the only way out of the existing chaos. Mr. Shuster's account of the whole episode is misleading by reason of its numerous suppressions, which can hardly have been accidental. He records the vote against accepting the Russian ultimatum on the 1st of December, but he does not mention that on the 21st of December a special committee appointed by the Mejliss to confer with the Cabinet agreed to obey the Russian demands. He contends that the vote of the 1st of December had put an

end to the existence of the Cabinet, but he does not mention that as the Mejliss had already been in existence for more than two years, it was officially dead, although it refused to disperse. The Fundamental Law provided for fresh elections at the end of two years, and the Mejliss had assembled at the capital on the 15th of November 1909. The Cabinet was on firm ground when it pointed out to the Regent that the law did not allow the representatives of the people 'to prolong 'their own session indefinitely.' Mr. Shuster's regard for accuracy would have commanded more respect if he had substituted these plain facts for his thrilling description of the hysterical outburst among Persian women.

First and last, Mr. Shuster was constitutionally in the wrong, and when at the end he was holding midnight conclaves with Deputies whose retention of office was illegal, he was placing himself in a grievously false situation. The very Mejliss he extols had ended by voting for his dismissal through its representatives on the special committee; and he ought to have made this point clear. In any case the closing of the Mejliss meant his official death; and when he decided that it was 'his duty to eliminate himself from the situation,' he had been already eliminated. All the abuse of Great Britain and Russia with which his pages are filled cannot alter the conclusion that he brought his fate upon himself. It has seemed desirable to dwell upon these aspects of Mr. Shuster's meteoric career in Persia, rather than upon his opposition to the terms of the Anglo-Russian Convention, because they are of the essence of the matter. The points upon which he came into direct conflict with Russia do not, by comparison, call for detailed discussion. His arbitrary and violent collision with the Russian representatives when he seized a house in which the Russian Bank had an interest, was high-handed and indefensible. Sir Edward Grey summed up all there is to be said about the case of Major Stokes when he telegraphed that 'the Russian Government have as good a right to protest 'against his being placed in control of gendarmerie in North 'Persia as we should have to protest against a control of the 'southern trade routes by Russians.' In no respect was Mr. Shuster more 'impossible' than in his handling of the Stokes incident. Even when M. Poklewski-Koziell held out an olive branch by proposing that a Swedish officer should

control the Treasury Gendarmerie in the north, and Major Stokes should command in the south, Mr. Shuster abruptly declined. When Count Benckendorff told Sir Edward Grey a year ago that the control of Persia was falling into Mr. Shuster's hands, he expressed an anxiety which was not unnatural. Russia has definite interests to conserve in Northern Persia, and she could not stand passively by while the Persian Government passed into the hands of an avowed foe of Russia and a handful of inflammable deputies. We need not marvel that in the end she demanded Mr. Shuster's dismissal and that the State Department at Washington remained discreetly silent.

Mr. Shuster has gone to air his grievances in America, but his book is a legacy which will furnish many texts for attacks upon Sir Edward Grey and British policy in Persia during the autumn session of Parliament. That is why it has been considered desirable to examine, at a length which may seem disproportionate, the fallacies it embodies. Condemnation of Mr. Shuster does not necessarily imply that British policy in Persia is beyond reproach, neither is it meant to indicate that the outlook in Persia can be regarded otherwise than with the gravest anxiety. Since his abrupt withdrawal, the position of Persia has grown no better, while in some respects it is worse. The Regent has departed for Europe, and is not expected to return. No new Mejliss has been summoned. It is said that Russia objects to the fresh election of an Assembly which has been inveterately hostile to her, and the explanation may be partly true ; but it is also true that a very large number of people in Persia have lost faith in the utility of a Mejliss. Persian finances, only very slightly helped by a small dole from Russia and Great Britain, are as scanty as ever. Salar-ed-Dowleh, the madcap brother of Mahomed Ali, is conducting a vague and unsuccessful revolt in the neighbourhood of Kermanshah. All the southern provinces are in a state of chronic confusion, and the trade routes, though not permanently blocked, are frequently raided. Russia has large numbers of troops at various points in the north, while Great Britain has a much smaller force in the south, chiefly consisting of a cavalry regiment at Shiraz. A general feeling of hopelessness prevails ; the cities do not even manifest the activity of despair ; all Persia has lapsed into a condition of

mournful lassitude tempered by occasional tribal outbreaks and raids.

This survey of Persian conditions has failed in its purpose if it has not furnished the answer to the inquiry with which it was prefaced. Representative institutions have for the time being vanished from Persia, not through external pressure, but because the country and the people were unfitted for them. There is very little present hope that they can be successfully revived. Perhaps they might have a better prospect of life if the Constitution were modified, and the powers of the Mejliss curtailed; but the calibre and attainments of the average Persian Minister are not encouraging. The one great opportunity of Persia in recent years lay in the hands of Mr. Shuster, and he deliberately threw it away. Like Mr. Facey Romford, he was 'not a man of much blandishment.' Had he been less truculent and uncompromising, had his mental horizon been a little wider, had he been less avid of open power, he might have been in Persia to-day. We may respect his sincerity, but as an administrator he trailed his coat. The chance he had will never recur.

Many excellent people, whose sympathetic instincts are in excess of their knowledge of the East, honestly believe that if Persia was left to herself she could still evolve a satisfactory form of government. Their faith finds little warranty in the facts which have been here recited. Let us suppose that Russia and Great Britain ceased to take an active interest in Persian affairs, that every Russian and British soldier was withdrawn from Persian territory, that the Persians were suddenly told to work out their own salvation without foreign assistance or advice. Is it conceivable that they could place their internal administration upon a stable footing? They could get no foreign loans, for no financiers would hand over large sums to Persian politicians without substantial security, which is not now available. The country would be exposed to the incursions of Turkish Kurds on one frontier, and marauding Afghans on the other. There would be a fierce struggle for the throne. The southern tribes would fight among themselves for the control of Shiraz and Ispahan. Every provincial Governor would become a law unto himself. A new Mejliss might be summoned, but it would gain no grip over the administration, for Persian Deputies only excel in

prolonged and unpractical deliberation. All Iran would rapidly fall to pieces.

Great Britain and Russia cannot contemplate such a calamitous possibility. Not in the interests of Persia, but rather in their own interests, both Powers are compelled to take an active and vigilant share in deciding the future of the Persian race. Mr. Shuster says he was never able to discover the special interests of the two Powers in Persia, but he must have been curiously blind, as indeed he often was. Nothing need be said of trade and treaties and loans, though these considerations have a definite importance. The necessity incumbent upon Great Britain and Russia to join in active endeavours to solve the Persian problem is derived from a broader basis. Great Britain is in the first place impelled by the instincts of self-preservation to maintain her Monroe Doctrine in the Middle East, which is that the Persian Gulf must remain inviolate. It would not long be free from foreign intrusion if British warships were withdrawn from the Gulf while Persia plunged into riotous anarchy. Nor can the greatest Empire in Southern Asia be content to watch a kingdom on her own borders fall into a confusion for which the world could show no existing parallel. Very similar considerations must influence Russia in the north. Russia has to govern large subject populations beyond the northern frontier of Persia. She, too, could not remain passive while the Persians entered upon a period of unending internal strife. Anarchy in Asia is not long confined within invisible frontiers. If unchecked, it spreads far and wide, and communicates its destructive spirit to other races. History affords no precedent for the suggestion that two mighty Powers can for ever stand at gaze while a great kingdom just outside their borders tears itself to shreds. There comes a time when intervention is imperative. It was partly reached in Persia some years ago. The need is far more urgent to-day.

The motives of both Powers have been incessantly challenged, both by some among their own subjects and still more by the Persians. The aims of Great Britain, at any rate, are absolutely beyond reproach. We have dominated the Persian Gulf for three hundred years, and have handed back to Persia every piece of territory we ever acquired, save only two tiny patches on the islands of Kishm and Henjam. We do not

seek a scrap of Persian soil, and would be thankful if we could leave the land of the Shahs in inglorious isolation for evermore. If we consulted our own desires, we would not send a single soldier to Persia, nor would we interfere in the smallest degree with the internal administration. The Government of India is sometimes accused of aggressive tendencies, but it has never regarded Persia as a Naboth's vineyard. Simla has no 'forward' policy, either with regard to Persia or to any other country beyond the administrative frontiers of India. The present Viceroy, Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, is understood to be intensely repugnant to all proposals for meddling with Persian affairs. It is further believed that he only obeyed the instructions to send the Central India Horse to Shiraz with the greatest reluctance. There is probably not a single British statesman of prominence who has the remotest desire for dominion in Persia.

Can similar statements be made about Russia? It is very difficult to say. Russian statesmen have some claim to be judged by their actions during the last few years. The verdict of cool observers will be based, not upon the misleading letterpress which has placed a false interpretation upon tragic photographs from Tabriz, not upon the excited stories of Persian refugees and their friends, not upon the views of people who count the number of Russian troops in Northern Persia and ignore the explanation, but rather upon the voluminous public records which few take the trouble to peruse. Englishmen scoff at Blue Books, but it may be safely asserted that no one can carefully study the series of Parliamentary Papers commencing with 'Persia No. 1 (1909)' without coming to conclusions about the policy of Sir Edward Grey and the actions of Russia, very different from those which find current expression in Radical newspapers. These documents contain ample proof that Russia has repeatedly exercised the very greatest restraint; that she has been faithful to her pledges to Great Britain; that both Powers for years pursued as far as possible a policy of non-intervention in Persian internal affairs; that Russia never sent troops to Persia without good reason, though sometimes in excessive numbers; that again and again the representatives of both Powers did their utmost to support the constitutional cause; and that when Russia finally developed hostility to the Nationalists, she did so under

extreme provocation. These contentions may all be demonstrated, and yet they do not state the complete truth. Whole provinces of Persia were acquired by Russia rather less than a century ago. Smaller strips have come under the sway of the eagles in more recent years. The presence of Russian troops in Persian territory is no new development. A Russian army occupied the province of Gilan so long ago as 1723, when Nadir Shah was still an obscure freebooter, and held it for more than ten years. The drift of Russia is southward as well as eastward, and a temporary check will not arrest tendencies which are older than modern statesmen, and more irresistible than paper engagements. We may give Russia every credit for her good faith since 1907; we may recognise that the Anglo-Russian Convention has proved a great deterrent, and may hope that its provisions will long be honourably observed; but it would be foolish not to recognise that the pressure of Russia upon Northern Persia is like the pressure of the ocean upon a weak and crumbling dyke. The breach will be made some day, and the tide will roll southward.

The day is not yet. The conversations between Sir Edward Grey and M. Sazonoff at Balmoral have demonstrated that Great Britain and Russia are still intent upon unity of aim in Persia, and that one more effort will be made to preserve the Shah's dominions. The precise lines of the policy now projected have still to be disclosed at the time of writing, but it is obvious that future developments will have four definite features. The first is that an attempt will be made to establish a stronger Government in Persia. The extent to which the new Administration will follow the provisions of the Persian Constitution—which no one, not even its framers, has ever interpreted very literally—is extremely problematical. It may be taken for granted that we shall not again see a Mejliss seizing executive control; and no Administration which tries to find its chief source of inspiration in unbounded hostility to Russia will receive Anglo-Russian support. Direct backing by officials representing Great Britain and Russia will probably be deemed a necessity; and this necessity brings into view the second consideration. There must be some geographical line of division within which the support given to the Persian administrators by English and Russian officials can be respectively exercised. Russian support, for example, would naturally

be chiefly exercised at Teheran, while British influence would find its most appropriate scope at Shiraz. The third principle is that the spheres of influence marked out in the Anglo-Russian Convention can no longer be rigidly observed. If Great Britain is to help a Persian Administration to gain stability, her good offices must chiefly be tendered in the sphere hitherto regarded as neutral. The fourth principle is that substantial financial help must be given if Persia is to rebuild her ruined administrative system. The appointment of a new Regent in place of the present absentee, and the selection of a Deputy-Regent for Southern Persia, may be noted as subsidiary possibilities.

These or somewhat similar expedients are probably to be tried, though their inauguration may be indefinitely postponed by the Balkan complication. When the time comes, they will doubtless be adopted by both Powers without very much hope of permanent success, but at least they may give Persia yet another chance of improving her position. The only real consolations they offer to British politicians are chiefly of a negative character. They do not involve either annexation or partition; if they are accepted by the Persian nation, they should not necessitate the despatch of more troops by either Power; and they contain no trace of those sinister designs which have so constantly of late been ascribed to Anglo-Russian policy in Persia. The solid gain of the Balmoral conversations is that they ensure the continuance of the Entente, a far more vital matter to Great Britain than the propping-up of a dozen Persias. It may well be feared that we have by no means reached a final solution of the Persian problem; it is highly possible that the projected steps may only prove to be the prelude to fresh and dangerous extensions of British responsibilities in Persia, extensions which might in the end be a perilous menace to the continuance of Anglo-Russian friendship; but the British elector, when he asks himself the questions already propounded in this article, will be a wiser man than the statesmen and diplomatists if he can discern any better way out of the present phase of the Persian difficulty.

For what are the alternatives? It has been shown that if Persia were left to work out her own destiny there would be a

hopeless collapse. The Persian people would be doomed to unimaginable misery, and Russia and Great Britain would obtain no real relief from their anxieties and responsibilities. Great Britain might adopt another course, and inform Russia that whatever her determination might be, there would be no further British intervention in Persian affairs. The outcome of such an intimation could not fail to be disastrous. The Anglo-Russian Convention would be instantly smashed, and the way would be left open for a renewal of Russian intrusion into Afghanistan, where the position of King Habibullah is already by no means secure. But that would be the least of the resultant evils, for a rupture with Russia regarding Persia would mean that the Entente would be smashed also. We might find ourselves without friends in Europe, and still have the bitter consciousness that we had done nothing either to help Persia or to protect the approaches to India. There are no sentimental delusions about Russian statesmen. They would interpret our refusal as a direct invitation to intervene, and the way would be left open for the extension of Russian influence to the shores of the Gulf. Russia would not long remain in solitary possession of the field. Germany has already sought to establish control over certain of the smaller Gulf islands, and on the withdrawal of British influence from the Persian mainland there would be a renewal of German activity at still more menacing points. Great Britain cannot adopt the third course of resisting a Russian entry into Persia. Sir Edward Grey has truly observed that he could not send a British army to Teheran. Only the forbearance of Russia stops her from absorbing Northern Persia ; she has no reason to fear the armed opposition of British forces. One wonders what ardent Radicals expect the British Government to do. Persian constitutionalism has come to grief, as was probably inevitable. We cannot fight Russia to enforce the continuance of a fallacious experiment, we cannot withdraw altogether, and we do not want to take the extreme step of partition and occupation. Is it not prudent to test the moderate projects which have been tentatively indicated ? Even if they are not permanently successful, they will at least postpone greater dangers.

Yet it cannot be denied that these new projects bring us a little nearer the time when Great Britain and Russia will no longer

have mountains and deserts dividing their Asiatic Empires. Whether the advent of that time would be very much accelerated by the construction of a trunk railway across Persia to India is a question which has recently aroused much heated controversy. The most reasonable view to take is that, just as all the vague rumours of the impending partition of Persia are wildly premature, so the horrific visions of Russian armies arriving by train on the banks of the Indus are almost as premature as discussions about the ultimate fate of the British Empire. There can be no harm in providing the public with authentic data on which to come to some decision about the Trans-Persian Railway, and the Government are only pledged to that innocent object. Long before the Trans-Persian project ceases to be academic, we may be face to face with far graver aspects of the Persian problem than are here set forth; for nothing is more certain than that there is no finality in the Balmoral solution. Persia is almost dead; already we seem to see her wraith beckoning us into new and unknown adventures; and we can no more turn back than Clive could turn after he had fought Plassey. He thought that the British should go no farther than Bengal, but his successors almost involuntarily followed the lure which led them to the Afghan hills and the Roof of the World. For if Empire has its glories, its melancholy burden is that it has no abiding frontier.

LOVAT FRASER.

No. CCCCXLIII will be published in January.

129815

P
LE Edinburgh Review.
E Vol. 216, July-Oct. 1912.

NAME OF BORROWER.

DATE.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED